

The Recollections of Encolpius

ANCIENT NARRATIVE

Supplementum 2

Editorial Board

Maaïke Zimmerman, *University of Groningen*
Gareth Schmeling, *University of Florida, Gainesville*
Heinz Hofmann, *Universität Tübingen*
Stephen Harrison, *Corpus Christi College, Oxford*
Costas Panayotakis (review editor), *University of Glasgow*

Advisory Board

Jean Alvares, *Montclair State University*
Alain Billault, *Université Jean Moulin, Lyon III*
Ewen Bowie, *Corpus Christi College, Oxford*
Jan Bremmer, *University of Groningen*
Ken Dowden, *University of Birmingham*
Ben Hijmans, Emeritus of Classics, *University of Groningen*
Ronald Hock, *University of Southern California, Los Angeles*
Niklas Holzberg, *Universität München*
Irene de Jong, *University of Amsterdam*
Bernhard Kytzler, *University of Natal, Durban*
John Morgan, *University of Wales, Swansea*
Ruurd Nauta, *University of Groningen*
Rudi van der Paardt, *University of Leiden*
Costas Panayotakis, *University of Glasgow*
Stelios Panayotakis, *University of Groningen*
Judith Perkins, *Saint Joseph College, West Hartford*
Bryan Reardon, Professor Emeritus of Classics, *University of California, Irvine*
James Tatum, *Dartmouth College, Hanover, New Hampshire*
Alfons Wouters, *University of Leuven*

Subscriptions

Barkhuis Publishing
Zuurstukken 37 9761 KP Eelde the Netherlands
Tel. +31 50 3080936 Fax +31 50 3080934
info@ancientnarrative.com www.ancientnarrative.com

The Recollections of Encolpius

The *Satyrical* of Petronius as Milesian Fiction

Gottskálk Jensson

BARKHUIS PUBLISHING
&
GRONINGEN UNIVERSITY LIBRARY
GRONINGEN 2004

Bókin er tileinkuð dætrum mínum
Ragnhildi og Ellen

Book design: Barkhuis Publishing
Dust-jacket design: Teikna Design Inc.
Printed by: Drukkerij Giethoorn ten Brink

ISSN 1568 3540
ISBN 90 807390 8 1

Table of contents

Preface	IX
PART 1 NARRATIVE	1
1.1 Text, Context and Identity	3
1.2 The Desultory Voice of Encolpius	29
PART 2 STORY	85
2.1 Sorting the Fragments	87
2.2 Retrospective Soliloquies and Dialogues	136
2.3 Rewriting the <i>Satyrica</i> (My Turn)	174
PART 3 GENRE	189
3.1 Ancient Narrative in Personis	191
3.2 The Hidden Genre	245
Abbreviations	303
Bibliography	305
Index	319
Abstract	329

Preface

Like probably every modern student of the *Satyrica*, I began working with a text that did not make a whole lot of sense to me. While reading the scholarly literature, furthermore, I was struck by the ubiquitous exceptionalism of twentieth-century Petronian studies. Numerous articles and books written within the last hundred years contain emphatic statements to the effect that Petronius is unlike any other author and the *Satyrica* a unique work to which no ordinary rules apply. It soon became clear to me that the very paradox of the *Satyrica* and its author—a paradox which had, as I found out, been created by scholars themselves not much more than a century ago—had come to function as a hermeneutic barrier in reading the *Satyrica*. Because Petronius was thought to be so exceptional, his text became virtually inexplicable and readers gave up trying to interpret the work as a coherent whole. Instead, most scholarly work concentrated on bits and pieces of the preserved text which could be usefully studied without having to deal with the problems of the genre or the narrator, beyond reaffirming the negative modern thesis that the one was synthetic and that behind the other hid the author.

Unsurprisingly, then, the conservative wish to respect the premises of the discipline and the institutional pressures to come up with new things to say about this ancient text have lately generated what are, in my view, some rather bizarre readings. One may be told variously that Encolpius' fictional autobiography is "the narrative equivalent" of a play, or that as a text it "resists" its own interpretation, or even that it is "anti-narrative", communicating only through the figures of language. Meanwhile, there has been no examination of the modern conception or reception of the *Satyrica*—clearly by now bankrupt as such, but all the same providing a basis for downbeat conservative scholarship and avant-garde theorizing alike—viz. that it was written to give a novelistic, even realistic description of the author's times, or the image of Petronius as an original Italian genius, "perhaps the only Roman who created his art independent of the Greeks". In the last sections of this study I attempt such an examination, but I have by no means exhausted the subject and much more could be said about the prejudices motivating the invention of the modern Petronius.

If we can relieve it of the baggage of its nineteenth-century reception, the *Satyrica* will turn out to be both less than it has recently been thought to be

and more than we had previously hoped. It can be thought of as a complicated literary game, informed by a sophistic reading of the Homeric *Odyssey*, but its rules are at least consistent and can be studied. Its humor and message are scholastic in a positive sense, learned and playful. The Lucianic author of the *Erotes*—a text which, as I show in my study, has much in common with the *Satyrica*—justifies such story telling in the prologue as relaxation for the educated scholar who is weary of unceasing attention to serious topics. But scholars are serious beings and their fun is not without a darker side. Preoccupation with shady topics is indeed a characteristic of the *Satyrica*, its tone is often sarcastic and the story hopelessly obscene. One aspect of this kind of literature is its examination of the ancient belief system of scholars, the scholarly view of the world. Reading it with attention today could provoke an examination of the modern reader's attitudes. Gian Biagio Conte argues quite correctly that the *Satyrica* is not mainly trying to advance a pseudo-aristocratic grudge against uneducated upstarts like Trimalchio but is, equally, an analysis of the rich but certainly confused and sometimes sordid mentality of the learned. The genre involves a playful dismantling of scholarly preconceptions, a kind of Saturnalia for the literati.

Petronius' *Satyrica* is a derivative text in two senses: firstly, it plays the genre-derivative game of satire and parody, and secondly, our Latin text by Petronius Arbiter looks and feels like a Roman palimpsest, a reworking of a preexisting Greek *Satyrica*, most likely called just that, Σατυρικά. The proposal that Petronius' text is a palimpsest has not been made before, and it was not an easy one to make. Such a hypothesis is, of course, the polar opposite of the belief in Petronian originality which has been unshaken since Mommsen's days and held by German, Italian, French, British and American scholars alike. Great scholars have been ridiculed for suggesting that Petronius had imitated a preexisting Greek genre or even borrowed a motif from Greek folktales. In fact, the few scholars who, like the German philologist Karl Bürger, dared to suggest that Petronius was writing a traditional work never argued for the possibility of a Roman palimpsest. What is meant by a "Greek model" in Petronian scholarship is never a single Greek text adapted by Petronius but either a "serious" (tragic) type of Greek novel to be parodied à la Heinze, or some hypothetical Greek genre which is designated by some such label as "realistic", "comic", "criminal" or the anachronistic "picaresque" (from the Spanish word *picaro*), with its German translation *Schelmenroman*. Although a rather obvious one, were it not for a scholarly blind spot, the possibility of a straightforward adaptation from an otherwise lost Greek text has not been entertained before, not even when scholars have attempted to list all the hypothetical possibilities (Jensson 2002, 88).

The present book is a substantially revised version of my dissertation, written in Rome and Toronto from 1994 to 1996, and defended at the University of Toronto in November 1996. At the time the text was accepted without changes, and therefore I should perhaps employ the Horatian topos and pride myself on having waited until the ninth year before publishing. But I cannot claim to have done so out of modesty or a desire to create a perfect work. In fact, the dissertation has been a copyrighted text in the public domain for most of this time. Having completed it, moreover, I further developed my redefinition of the generic term “Milesian” in a paper I read at a graduate seminar in Toronto in March 1997, and again in a reworked form under the title “Milesian Tales: Short Stories or Novels?” at the CAC Meeting in June 1997 in Newfoundland. The arguments advanced in these talks, which were not published as such but are now integrated into this study, are in many ways similar to those presented by Stephen Harrison at the Groningen Colloquia on the Novel (May 1997) in a paper published a year later in the homonymous series under the title “The Milesian Tales and the Roman Novel”. At the time neither of us knew of the other’s work. I should also mention that an article I published in *Ancient Narrative* 2, “The *Satyrica* of Petronius as a Roman palimpsest”, is a byproduct of the present study. Unfortunately, it is not impossible that this book, because its completion has taken so long, does not adequately reflect relevant literature published since 1996. I have, however, tried to take recent work into consideration in my rewriting, and in the meantime I have undertaken to review significant new books (see bibliography); formulations developed in those reviews have admittedly contributed in places to the present text.

At various stages I have benefited from the advice of helpful readers and referees, and many colleagues and friends have provided generous help to me while writing and rewriting this book. I owe them all an immense debt. Originally my readership was composed of a select few, the members of my committee, all of whom were encouraging and ready with advice. I am certainly most grateful to my supervisor Roger Beck, who never showed signs of losing faith when my initial attempts were unsuccessful, and later read drafts of individual chapters thoroughly and wrote useful comments in the margin, several of which have found their way into the present text. I would also like to extend my gratitude to Brad Inwood, who in the office of graduate coordinator was more actively involved than was required of him. It has been my good fortune to work with Hugh Mason, whose knowledge of ancient prose narratives proved invaluable, and Christopher Jones whose graduate seminar on the ancient novel constituted the beginning of the work that has led to the present book. Alison Keith, Eric Csapo and Catherine

Connors deserve special thanks for their helpful suggestions and friendly advice. Neither should I forget to mention the valuable insights of Gerald Sandy whose report on my thesis I have made use of in my rewriting. Arthur James, Patricia Fagan and Robert Nickle, fellow graduate students at Toronto, frequently lent patient ears to my discursive experimentation relating to the vast problems of the *Satyrica*. I also wish to remember the staff of the Robarts Library and the adjacent Thomas Fisher Rare Book Library which houses many Petronian treasures bequeathed by the late Gilbert Bagnani. Similarly, my warm thanks go to Ann-Marie Matti of the Department of Classics at the University of Toronto.

I owe to Maaïke Zimmerman the fact that my book has now finally been printed. After reading a copy of the dissertation I had sent to a colleague of hers in Groningen, she wrote me to suggest the possibility of publishing it as an *Ancient Narrative Supplement*. I am also grateful to Minna Skafte Jensen for reading my work and encouraging me to publish, and to Tarrin Wills, Michael Chesnutt, Matthew Driscoll and Christopher Sanders, at The Arnamagnæan Institute in Copenhagen, where most of the rewriting took place, who have provided much good advice on the English language. My friend Claudia Neri deserves warm thanks both for generously offering to design the dust jacket and for all the help she provided while I was writing the dissertation. Last but not least, I wish to acknowledge the vital support of my wife Annette Lassen who has read the entire text in typescript and suggested many improvements. Despite all the help I have received the following text will surely still contain imperfections. It goes without saying that I alone am responsible for the remaining errors, misunderstandings and infelicities.

Part 1

Narrative

1.1 Text, Context and Identity

1.1.1 Rewriting the *Satyrice*

This study is an attempt to interpret the *Satyrice* in accordance with its original design as an extended fictional narrative, in defiance of the severe limitations imposed by the fragmented state of the extant text. Despite the copious measures of material still extant from the original *Satyrice* (175 pages in the standard edition),¹ anyone wishing to advance a literary interpretation of the work faces the daunting task of working with an extraordinarily fragmented text. As the result of obscure events in the textual history of the *Satyrice*, the modern text must be reassembled from four different and overlapping traditions, the most extensive of which owes its preservation largely to late sixteenth-century printed editions.² Beyond these four textual traditions there are several important allusions to the work in late ancient sources (e.g., Servius, Boethius, Sidonius Apollinaris and Fulgentius), and some loose poems from separate traditions attributed to Petronius.

When this modern patchwork of a text is read through, it becomes apparent from the contents that what we have first opens late in the story—probably no earlier than in the latter half of the original—and breaks off before there is an end in sight. That this is the case is also indicated by manuscript evidence which assigns the extant text to books 14, 15 and 16.³ The extant material could well derive from more than three books and thus take us beyond book 16, but we cannot say how many books there were in all. If the book numbers are to be trusted, the scale of the original appears to have been at least four times the extant text.

¹ Müller, K. 1995. *Petronius Satyricon reliquiae*, Stuttgart and Leipzig.

² The Long Fragments (L), see Richardson 1993. The other textual traditions are the Short Excerpts (O), the *Florilegia* (φ), which cover much less, and provide practically no other material than L; and finally there is the *Cena Trimalchionis* (H), which represents the only continuous and whole text, as far as it goes, and is preserved in a single manuscript, the Traguriensis or *codex Parisiensis latinus* 7989. For attempts to explain the obscure history of the text, and especially the unclear relationship between L, O and φ, see Müller 1983, 381ff.; Reardon 1983, 295ff.; Richardson 1975, 290ff.; van Thiel 1971, 2ff.

³ Chapters 1.1–26.6 are likely to represent fragments from book 14. Book 15 most likely began at 26.7, with the arrival of a new day. How many books are represented by the rest (likely more than one), or where divisions are to be placed, is problematic. For a further discussion of the problem, see, e.g., Müller 1983, 410ff.

These statistics, however, do not tell the whole story, since the information that we have is by no means limited to what is fully preserved of the text. As in other extended fictional narratives, internal allusions abound. In theory at least, the entire context of the *Satyrice* is implicit in every preserved sentence. A few words can sometimes supply enough information to outline the contents of entire episodes. As it happens, the information available to us has not been recognized for what it is worth. Because of the nineteenth-century misunderstanding of certain crucial external fragments, and the general lack of interest in the larger form of the work in the twentieth century, there is a strong tendency in the scholarship to trivialize the significance of internal allusions, despite the fact that the extant text is conditioned by earlier episodes. My findings in this study indicate that we can improve considerably our knowledge of the plot in the missing early parts of the story, leading up to the point where the extant text begins.

There is no denying that the study of the *Satyrice* has been greatly hampered by the incompleteness of the text, but another factor of major consequence is also a general, but not necessarily justified perplexity regarding the authenticity of what is extant. Even the current approach to the text, which was initiated and defined by Franz Bücheler's critical edition of 1862, fails to show adequate respect for the tradition. As I show in section 1.2.4 of my study, the narrative of the *Satyrice* properly represents "spoken" discourse to be listened to, as opposed to a "written" text to be read, which explains why the style is so colloquial and improvised in flavor. This allows for unusual forms, colloquial syntax, brevity in descriptions, loose ends, and quirky transitions. Recently published Greek papyri of prosimetric fiction indicate that it may be unreasonable to expect a fully polished literary text in this genre.⁴ Such a text does not invite rationalizing emendation. In fact, there is no reason to be overly skeptical about the tradition. As far as it goes, it seems reliable in preserving an unusual and very difficult text. In any case, nothing is known about the circumstances surrounding the loss of most of the text, and very little is known about the origin and relationships of the four overlapping traditions. There exists therefore no reliable historical basis on which to ground a systematic emendation of the text. Under these circumstances editorial conservatism seems obligatory.

The history of editorial responses to our text, however, reveals an astonishing unwillingness to accept the received tradition, as is demonstrated by the unusually great number of misguided attempts at repair, ranging from creative rewriting, to arbitrary reshuffling of fragments, to wholesale pruning

⁴ See Stephens and Winkler 1995, 365, n. 19.

of supposedly alien elements. The record shows that the text of the *Satyrica* has throughout history been threatened by a strange license taken with it by scribes and scholars alike. This attitude is discernible already in the methods of the earliest “editor” of the work, the collector of the Short Excerpts (O). This unknown scribe seems to have been chiefly interested in sampling poetic and literary passages, and censoring pornographic material of the “homosexual” type. He appears to have attempted to stitch together the gaps where he had left out material, implying new continuity by means of clever juxtaposition.⁵ From the same manner of license stemmed Nodot’s publication (Paris 1694) of a supposedly complete text—passed off as the transcript of a newly found manuscript—that proved to be a forgery. This literary hoax is an entertaining story on its own, but the promised *Petronius restitutus* is little more than the present fragments with the gaps imaginatively supplemented.⁶ Again the creative approach was attempted by Marchena (1800), who fleshed out the fragmentary Quartilla episode with sexually explicit material that owed little to the obscenity of the original.⁷

The erotic nature of the *Satyrica* is certainly a factor contributing to the licentious approach which is traditionally taken to this text. Many of the difficulties that have beset the text throughout the ages derive from the irreconcilability of the work’s pornographic material with the moral values of scribes and scholars.⁸ Whether in the libidinous additions of Marchena or in the censorious logic that guided the excerptor of the Short Fragments (O), the sexually explicit material in the *Satyrica* has been crucial for its textual preservation.

Today, this clash of values can be seen in the different reception afforded the least obscene part of the work, the *Cena Trimalchionis*, and the considerably more indecent main body of the *Satyrica*’s text. The *Cena*, which is regularly published separately and sets the boundaries for most learned commentaries (e.g., Friedländer, Marmorale, Perrochat and Smith),⁹ is also traditionally the focus of half of all the scholarship on the *Satyrica*.¹⁰ This exaggerated concentration on one third of the whole continues to produce readings of the *Cena* out of context, and is ultimately responsible for the

⁵ See Müller 1983, 420ff.

⁶ See Stolz 1987.

⁷ Rose 1966, 268ff., prints the supplements.

⁸ Slater’s 1990, 40, denial of the pornographic nature of the work overlooks much material, and relies on a too narrow definition of pornography.

⁹ It is, however, not correct to say that there exist no commentaries on the whole of the work; see, e.g., Paratore 1933, vol. 2, and Pellegrino 1975, 205–443. Many editions and translations also provide important commentaries in the form of notes.

¹⁰ See the bibliography of Schmeling and Stuckey 1977.

rampant generalizations about the whole work based on that part alone. It seems no coincidence that this section of the text which most easily meets with moral approval should also be the best preserved, and vice versa. Most likely, the great loss of text was caused, not by accident, but by biased neglect or deliberate destruction. We should therefore be wary of the circularity of the argument that is often used to account for the modern neglect of the L-tradition in comparison with the much studied *Cena Trimalchionis*. Its inferior quality as text (real and hypothesized—discussed further below) in comparison to the *Cena* is hardly a legitimate rationale for continued disregard, since it was negligent attitudes in the first place that led to such poor preservation.

It goes without saying that the wildly creative restorations of Nodot and Marchena were rejected by modern editors, who have nevertheless failed to see the analogy with their own sometimes no less radical manipulation of the text. Related to the modern neglect of the Long Fragments is their indirect subversion by an over-confident indication of “new lacunae”. A defense for this editorial practice could point out that the Long Fragments (L), where they overlap with the early sections of the *Cena*, 27.1 – 37.6, are misleadingly presented as an unbroken text and fail to indicate about eight short passages found in the *Cena*. This is certainly a cogent sign of poor quality in the L-tradition, although not a formal proof, since the argument involves generalizing about the whole text from a few passages that could, theoretically, be of inferior quality. It would, however, be wrong-headed to deny the importance of this evidence and it can surely be accepted. At this point, however, caution is needed, for although we may assume *that* there must be lacunae, we have no method of determining *where* they are and *what* is missing. To clarify this point, a brief examination is needed of the manifest but unmarked gaps in the L-tradition, where it overlaps with the *Cena*. This is, after all, the only place in the whole text where we can check the nature and location of the lacunae against some evidence.

What strikes one first is that all eight gaps in the overlapping area are small, one to four lines each, and therefore no crucial material for understanding the narrative has been lost. At least two seem the result of carelessness in copying. The eye of the copier has missed a line because the same word occurred in two lines in a row (34.7 *vinum* and 35.4 *super*).¹¹ More to the point, half of the lacunae would have gone completely unnoticed (27.4f., 28.3, 28.6f., 29.9f.) without the singular advantage offered by the complete text in the *Cena* manuscript, since in those places where the gaps occur there

¹¹ van Thiel 1971, 66.

is no discernible break in continuity.¹² As for the other four (30.5f., 34.4, 34.7, 35.4), three of them could neither have been identified with certainty, nor supplemented without the *Cena*. This leaves us with only one lacuna (35.4), which would sooner or later have been noticed and could partly have been supplemented because it occurs in the middle of a fixed zodiacal catalogue, a context which determines that *scorpio* must be the missing sign, although the item placed on top of it would have remained a mystery (editors have not even accepted the evidence of the *Cena* manuscript on this account).

The editio Tornaesiana (Lyons 1575), a handy little book in octavo and a major witness to the L-tradition, provides us with an excellent proof that our estimation is more than mere pessimism. Uncontaminated with the *Cena* (the *Traguriensis* manuscript had not yet been discovered) and clearly attempting to be critical in its presentation of the text, the Tornaesiana prints the section in question without noticing the first seven lacunae at all. However, the editor, Tornaesius, suspects the eighth one (35.4), suggests a possible supplement in case of a lacuna, and gets the missing words *super scorpionem* correctly, although not the item on top.¹³ Significantly, he also hypothesizes three lacunae which are not in *H* (28.1, 31.2f., 37.1), two of which are conjectures, as is carefully noted on the margin,¹⁴ and all of which were rejected by Müller.¹⁵

¹² 27.4–5, *cum has ergo miraremus lautitias*, || *Trimalchio digitos concrepuit* ... (“While we were admiring these refinements, || Trimalchio snapped his fingers ...”)

28.3, *iam Trimalchio unguento perfusus tergebatur, non linteis, sed palliis ex lana mollissima factis. tres interim iatraliptae in conspectu eius Falernum potabant*. || *hinc involutus coccina gausapa lecticae impositus est* ... (“Awash in fragrant oil Trimalchio was being rubbed down, not with linen cloths, but with towels made from the softest wool. Meanwhile before his eyes his three masseurs were drinking Falernian wine. || Then wrapped in a bright red dressing gown he was placed in a litter”)

28.6–8, *sequimur nos admiratione iam saturi et cum Agamemnone ad ianuam pervenimus*. || *in aditu autem ipso stabat ostiarius prasinatus* ... (“We followed having by now satisfied our appetite for wonder and arrived in the company of Agamemnon to the door || At the very entrance stood a porter wearing green ...”)

29.9–30.1, *interrogare ergo atriensem coepi, quas in medio picturas habent*. “*Iliada et Odyssean*” *inquit*. || *iam ad triclinium perveneramus* ... (“I began to ask the janitor about the images they had in the middle. ‘The *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*’, he replied. || We had now reached the triclinium ...”)

¹³ An asterisk in the text, page 34f., refers to the following marginal note: *deest fortassis super scorpionem eiusdem nominis pisces*, i.e., the phrase possibly missing is “*super ... pisces*.”

¹⁴ Where it says, “*non est nota in v[eteribus]c[odicibus]*”, and “*deest aster in v.c.*”

¹⁵ Surprisingly so, perhaps, considering that editor’s penchant for accepting such suggestions and incorporating them into the text.

Since we generalized about the quality of the whole L-tradition on the basis of its overlapping with the *Cena*, we must also recognize the implications of this low success-rate, only a part of one corruption out of a total of eight, for the likelihood of locating and correctly filling lacunae by guesswork. Moreover, since the exceptional case of a missing item in a fixed catalogue is not likely to present itself often, the little success that was shown can in practice be reduced to none. It is salutary to remember that modern editors have few tools in their hands which were not available also to the editor of the *Tornaesiana*, since this sort of emendation relies entirely on the editor's "feeling" for the Latin language and logic of the story.

The unlikelihood of improving the text, however, has by no means weakened the confidence of modern editors in hypothesizing lacunae and lacuna-related corruptions in the text of the *Satyrica*. In the present standard edition (Müller 1995), no less than six new editorial lacunae have cropped up in the very same overlapping area that we have been discussing (27.1 – 37.6). On the whole, no editor was more productive in this field than Bücheler (Berlin 1862), over forty of whose new editorial lacunae Müller has incorporated into the modern text. I count no fewer than seventy-five dotted (...) new lacunae in the 1995 edition, which must be added to the one hundred and fourteen asterisked (*) old ones, i.e., *lacunae librorum auctoritate testatae*.¹⁶

These asterisks derive from the L-tradition, which uses them to mark lacunae, although they can signify various other things as well.¹⁷ Sometimes lacunae seem to have entered the text out of ambiguity about the meaning of the asterisks.¹⁸ Given the obscure origins of the L-tradition, whose main witnesses are printed editions, some of the "authoritative" lacunae are likely to be conjectures in the first place. In recent editions, however, not even the *Cena* itself has been spared new lacunae, whose single witness, the manuscript *Traguriensis*, nevertheless presents an unbroken text.¹⁹ In the 1995 edition, there are over twenty speculative lacunae in the *Cena*. By "specula-

¹⁶ For comparison Ernout's more conservative edition (*cinquième tirage*, 1962) has 36 dotted lacunae and 121 asterisked ones.

¹⁷ The O-class manuscripts lack indications of lacunae and present a continuous text. The *Tornaesiana*, an L-class witness, inserts one or more asterisks into the text, and uses two kinds of asterisks (six points = *lacunae*; five points = marginal gloss). Other L-class witnesses use multiple asterisks to indicate corruption in the text. They are variously placed within running lines, at the end or the beginning, or in otherwise empty lines. They can also indicate generic breaks in the discourse, especially before and after speeches and poems.

¹⁸ See Di Simone 1993, 88 n.5, for a case of such misunderstanding involving both Müller 1983 and van Thiel 1971.

¹⁹ "[T]he lacunae, if they exist, being few and unimportant", notes Gaselee 1915, in the introduction to his facsimile edition and transcript of the manuscript.

tive” I mean that the introduction of these gaps into the text of the *Satyrice* is based on *subjektive Deutungen*, i.e., pure guesswork. Moreover, the majority of the new editorial lacunae have been inserted without arguments for their support. By comparison, Helm’s edition of the *Metamorphoses* of Apuleius has four lacunae in a text that is often difficult to make sense of and considerably longer than the *Satyrice*. Such steady accretion of textual ruptures has made the reading of the *Satyrice*—never an easy affair—increasingly difficult.

Other such licenses with the text involve the hypothesized dislocation of passages, this too on the ground of *subjektive Deutungen*. A case in question is three elegiac distichs (14.1), which apparently come out of the blue in the middle of Encolpius’ narrative. Bücheler, partly on the authority of Anton’s 1781 edition, postponed these verses by about five lines and appended them to words uttered by the character Ascyrtos in that passage. There, for the most part, they have sat ever since.²⁰ This amounts to preferring the opinion of Anton and Bücheler to the authority of the best witness available of an L-class manuscript, a sixteenth-century transcription in the hand of Pierre Daniel.²¹ Nor is it necessary to find an explicit speaker for the verse. It is in the nature of prosimetry that the narrator can dispense with declarative statements when switching from one discourse type to another. Besides, the moving of these distichs does not improve the text, since in their new place they disrupt the continuity of the passage that was there before.²² Less serious, perhaps, but belonging to the same type of arbitrary editorial practices, is the isolation from their proper context of two other distichs (80.9 vv. 5–8), through Bücheler’s introduction of lines to mark them off in the printed text. These unprecedented marks proved to be an influential factor in one recent critic’s reading of the *Satyrice*, which presupposes a contextual autonomy

²⁰ Pellegrino 1975, however, has put them back in their original place, although, in the first volume of his multivolume edition (1986), they have unnecessarily been marked off by asterisks to indicate *lacunae*.

²¹ See Richardson 1993, 81–98.

²² Ascyrtos says: “*mihi plane placet emere, quamvis nostrum sit, quod agnoscimus, et parvo aere recuperare potius thesaurum quam in ambiguam litem descendere*” (“Of course I want to buy it, though it’s ours, as we know, and to recover the treasure for a small fee rather than to get into an uncertain lawsuit”). [here the verses have been inserted] *Sed praeter unum dipondium sicel lupinosque quibus destinaveramus mercari, nihil ad manu erat* (“But apart from one sekel worth two pennies and lupine seeds we intended to use as money, we had nothing at hand”). Fraenkel’s emendation [*sicel*] <quo> *lupinos[que quibus]*, accepted by Müller, is too cumbersome. In support of the received text, see Schmeling 1992b, 531–36. The σίκλος or σήγλος (Greek forms of the Semitic *sekel* or *shekel*) is a coin. For lupine seeds as fake money, cf. Pl. *Poen.* 597 ff.; Hor. *Ep.* 1.7.22ff.

for the verses.²³ Read through, however, this latter half of an eight line elegiac poem appears completely sound and follows freely from the context of the first part.

In another and perhaps more serious case (55.3), a humorous comment has been struck out of the text, and a “poem” has been corrected on metrical grounds, despite its being presented in demonstration of a character’s ignorance and lack of versifying skills. In the *Traguriensis* manuscript, the sole witness to the humorous comment, the text runs like this:

... statimque codicillos poposcit et non
 diu cogitatione distorta haec recitavit:
 ‘quod non expectes, ex transverso fit
 et super nos Fortuna negotia curat.’
 —Distichon Trimalchionis est cum elego suo:—
 ‘quare da nobis vina Falerna, puer.’
 Ab hoc epigrammate coepit poetarum esse mentio ...

At once he demanded his notebook, and after a meditation that was not long he read aloud these distorted verses:
 ‘What you don’t expect happens transversely,
 and over our heads Fortune takes care of business.’
 —This is Trimalchio’s distich, with his elegiac line:—
 ‘So give us the Falernian wine, boy!’
 From this epigram the chat moved on to poets ...

Bücheler declared as interpolation the phrase, *distichon Trimalchionis est cum elego suo*, but the mocking irony which defines the first two quite unmetrical lines of Trimalchio’s “distorted” (*distorta*) composition as “the distichon of Trimalchio” and the third as “his elegiac line”, and ends by calling the entire composition “this epigram”, makes the case for a scribal gloss seem unlikely.²⁴ In fact, the term “distichon” is not being used correctly (as one would expect in a grammarian) but rather to make it all the more obvious that Trimalchio’s “poetics” do not conform to the rules of versification. Only the narrator, with his ironic and critical stance towards Trimalchio, is likely to be responsible for this catachrestic use of a technical term. The implication is that, here as elsewhere, Trimalchio is displaying his tendency to

²³ Slater 1990, 13.

²⁴ I take *elego* (*sc. verso*) to be the adjective *elegus*, *-a*, *-um*. The singular, although it rarely occurs for obvious reasons, is nevertheless logical enough, and is found in the grammarian Diomedes (502 P, *elegum metrum*).

do things *novo more*, just as he does in his mad revisions of classical mythology. The narrator's interruption of the delivery of Trimalchio's poetry to make the comment in the present of the narration, and then to resume the delivery of the last line to complete the piece, is the kind of playfulness which is in keeping with the tradition of prosimetry.²⁵ Although the interjected phrase is in plain language, a lively performance (with appropriate switches in tone of voice) could make it very amusing. The editors of the *Satyrica* have shown insensitivity to the possibilities of this form by "correcting" the joke. The text of the *Traguriensis* is, in my view, not in need of emendation here.

Further changes have been introduced into this short passage. On the analogy of Trimalchio's first poem (34.10), which is composed of two hexameters and one pentameter (an otherwise unheard-of arrangement in good literature),²⁶ Müller concluded (following Bücheler, following Heinsius) that the end of the first line and the beginning of the second had to be missing (because neither line scans), and so he added words to the text (*ubique* in the first line and *nostra* in the second) in an attempt to make the "poetry" of Trimalchio conform to the rules of meter.²⁷ But even after these learned improvements, the two lines are not a "distichon", nor is the composition as a whole an "epigram". The reason why only Trimalchio's first composition scans, but not his second, could be that the first is supposedly recited from memory, while the second is clearly meant from the context to be composed on the spot.²⁸ We do not, however, need to prove the soundness of the humorous comment, merely in order to retain it, for the burden of proof obviously lies with those who wish to assume the license of rewriting the text.²⁹

²⁵ Cf. *Sat.* 79.8–9, *sine causa gratulor mihi* ("I congratulate myself without a reason"), the narrator's comment in the present tense on the immediately preceding verse. The present tense comes naturally to the narrator when he reflects upon the narrative or comments on the experience of telling the story (e.g., 70.8, *pudet referre quae secuntur* ["One is ashamed to tell what follows"]). The present of the narrator refers to the moment of telling the story, while the present of the characters is, from the standpoint of the narrator, in the past. *Sen. Apoc.* 5 offers an example of interruption of poetry for the interjection of a humorous comment, and then resumption. *Sat.* 108.14, where a non-poetic *verbum dicendi, exclamat*, is inserted into the middle of a line of hexameter (discussed below), is another such interruption in the delivery of poetry.

²⁶ Examples are found in the *Anthologia Palatina* (13.15), but Barnes 1971, 303–4, convincingly argues for its subliterate status and unconventionality by noting "that the metrical arrangement is found basically in funerary inscriptions on plebeian tombstones."

²⁷ Walsh 1970, 128, rejected the changes and argued for the appropriateness of the verses to the persona of "the poetic tiro" Trimalchio.

²⁸ Suggested by Slater 1990, 161 n.11.

²⁹ While editors have forced Trimalchio's non-poem (55.3) to scan, no attempts have been

And there is more of the same. Several truly adventurous attempts have been made to reorganize the fragments of the *Satyrica*. Two scholars in particular, Italo Sgobbo (1930) and Helmut van Thiel (1971), have advanced influential theses proposing to reshuffle, not just paragraphs, but whole episodes of the extant text. The former proposed to move the whole of the Quartilla episode on the basis of his understanding of the work's topography, while the latter suggested the rearranging of fragments in accordance with his hypothesis regarding the synthetic nature of the Long Fragments (L), although he admits that his complex hypothesis is ultimately not provable, and, even if proven, would not offer the necessary guidance for rearranging the fragments.³⁰

The last item on our list of misguided reactions to the problematic state of the *Satyrica*'s text is a sweeping and still very influential hypothesis about supposed "scribal interpolations" in the work. Acting on the assumption that the L-tradition was put together in Carolingian times from badly damaged sources, Müller in his first edition of the text (aided and influenced by Eduard Fraenkel)³¹ hypothesized a learned *auctor* of the Long Fragments (L) who was to have interpolated his own explanations into the text to restore it.³² As a criterion for spotting these "foreign bodies" (*Fremdkörper*), Fraenkel, according to Müller himself, formed "a very personal conception of the elegant brevity and precision of Petronian prose" (*eine sehr persönliche Vorstellung von der eleganten Knappheit und Präzision der petronischen Prosa*), which was arbitrarily made to serve as the touchstone of textual authenticity.³³ The ominous Tacitean term "elegant" (*eleganten*) demonstrates clearly the fallacy of authorial intention behind this further attempt to meddle with the text. The cult of the author (a product of the grammar school)

made to correct or represent typographically as verses the poetic lines of 99.3, although the imagery ("*incultis asperisque regionibus diutius nives haerent, ast ubi aratro domefacta tellus nitet, dum loqueris levis pruina dilabitur*" ["The snows cleave longer to rough and uncultivated regions, but where the soil made meek with the plough is radiant, the light flakes melt away even as you speak"]) as well as the diction (*ast, domefacta, tellus* and *pruina* meaning 'snow') are indeed poetic, while the utterance issues from the mouth of a capable versifier, the character Encolpius.

³⁰ van Thiel 1971, 9.

³¹ Müller 1983, 471f.

³² The assumption that the text has been meddled with has been strangely tempting to scholars throughout history. The initial response to the rediscovery of the *Traguriensis* manuscript by Marino Statileo in the seventeenth century shows this. Two scholars, Johan Christoph Wagenseil and Adrien de Valois, argued then, on the basis of the unclassical Latin spoken by the freedmen, that *H* was a modern forgery. Strangely enough, this was in 1666, before the appearance of the first actual forgery, that of Nodot (Paris 1694).

³³ Müller 1983, 472.

can be counted on to insist that the *elegantiae arbiter* of a Roman emperor must have expressed himself in “elegant” Latin, and then derive the meaning of the term from the highly developed rules associated with it by the Italian humanists rather than its rudimentary definition in ancient stylistics.³⁴ And this despite the fact that Tacitus is referring to this “title” given the consular Petronius ironically and never indicates that stylistics have anything to do with his supposed *elegantia*, but rather refinement in perverted pleasures.³⁵ Incidentally, the term is also used ironically (and with no reference to stylistics) in the *Satyrica* about Trimalchio’s unrefined taste.³⁶ However, in Müller’s first edition of the text (1961), no less than one hundred and fifty words and passages (some quite long) were printed in square brackets to mark them off as interpolations.

The result was not only a scholarly controversy that severely undermined the edition (and led many scholars to continue using the older edition of Ernout [1923]),³⁷ but also a text which was very hard to read because of the ambiguous status of the bracketed passages. In several subsequent revisions of his edition Müller has drastically reduced the number of suspected *loci*, however, without abandoning the idea entirely. Although in theory the attempt is to correct the text on the grounds of some impossible esthetic *Vorstellung* about what kind of style would be most appropriate to an author

³⁴ In Roman stylistics *elegantia* is a translation of the Greek term ἐκλογή ὀνομάτων “choice of words”. The seminal Renaissance work here is Lorenzo Valla’s *De linguae Latinae elegantia libri sex* (1444), which laid the rules, *regulae*, for a new understanding of ancient Latin stylistics, and was reworked into many of the textbooks on composition and syntax later used by the humanist schooling system. On the meaning of *elegantia* in the Petronian context, see Dell’Era 1970, 21f.

³⁵ *Ann.* 16.18: *dein revolutus ad vitia seu vitiorum imitatione inter paucos familiarium Neroni adsumptus est, elegantiae arbiter, dum nihil amoenum et molle adfluentia putat, nisi quod ei Petronius adprobavisset. unde invidia Tigellini quasi adversus aemulum et scientia voluptatum potiorem.* (“Then falling back into vice or the imitation of vice, he was recruited by Nero to be one of his few intimate associates, as the arbiter of elegance, while the emperor thought nothing charming or refined in luxury unless Petronius had recommended it to him. Hence the envy on the part of Tigellinus, who saw him as a rival and some one more expert in the science of pleasure.”) Tacitus only once uses the term *elegantia* in the stylistic sense (*Ann.* 13.3) and then about the emperor Claudius; elsewhere it means something like “refined table manners” (*Ag.* 21.3, *conviviorum elegantiam*), “good habits” (*Hist.* 3.39, *elegantiam morum*; *Ann.* 5.8, *morum elegantia*), “tastefulness in a woman” (*Ann.* 13.46, *elegantiam uxoris*), or “respectable life style” (*Ann.* 14.19, *elegantia vitae*).

³⁶ *Sat.* 34.4, *laudatus propter elegantias dominus* (“the host was praised for the refined arrangements”); cf. also *Sat.* 60.1, *tam elegantes strophas* (“such sophisticated turns”).

³⁷ Coccia 1973, 11, has a list of reviews of Müller’s 1961 edition. Coccia’s own book is entirely a reaction to the interpolation hypothesis. On the topic, cf. also Smith 1975, xxiii–iv, and Müller himself, who has a survey in Müller 1983, 474f.

reputed to be “elegant”,³⁸ Fraenkel and Müller nevertheless struck out passages not only for stylistic reasons, but because they contained references which connected episodes to one another. The continuity of the story in these places was considered too artificial by the editors.³⁹ The outcome, of course, is a text that is more fragmented than ever.

Taken together these unbalanced responses to the text of the *Satyrice*, ranging from creative and fantastic restorations, rejected by serious editors, to cumulative puncturing, reshuffling of fragments, and pruning of passages, perpetrated by those same editors, have in common an unjustifiably high degree of confidence in the possibility of restoring the textual tradition. Clearly, we gain nothing by continuing this approach. It is not so much a question of being right as of adopting a sensible working hypothesis. We have no choice but to respect the text as it has been handed down by tradition, which means avoiding changes if at all possible. Filling the gaps and increasing their number is equally disrespectful of textual authority.⁴⁰ The chances of scoring in the game of textual correction should be recognized as slim, unless the context is a wholly predetermined one, as in the case of the zodiacal catalogue. We therefore conclude that a new edition, according to conservative principles, is still needed.

1.1.2 The Other Text(s)

The troubles besetting the text of the *Satyrice* at the hands of editors have never deterred interpreters from devising critical strategies to solve the per-

³⁸ See Parker 1994 for a telling example of how a simple phrase in standard classical Latin was misunderstood by three centuries of editors and translators, after its misinterpretation was first introduced by a seventeenth-century commentator. The case raises a legitimate concern over whether the sensitivity of scholars to Petronian Latin is at all up to the task of correcting on stylistic grounds the fragments of the almost two-thousand-year-old *Satyrice*.

³⁹ Vital passages in the Quartilla episode which link it to the preceding market scene and the following dinner at Trimalchio’s were bracketed. In the 1983 and 1995 editions, 16.3 and 25.2 are still treated as “interpolations”, although 26.7 has been restored to the text.

⁴⁰ Müller and Ehlers 1983 in two instances curiously enough both identify a lacuna, in 108.1 and in 123 v. 236, and then fill it “*exempli gratia*”, as they say, by inventing wholesale the supposedly missing phrases (Müller’s addition runs like this: *prae pudore vix eram mentis compos; praebebat enim foedissimum adspectum*—“from shame I was hardly in control of my thoughts; for it resulted in a disgusting look”; Ehlers adds a whole hexameter: *haud secus hic acuit Martem, formidine victus*—“in this way he prepared for war, overcome by fear”). One cannot help but wonder whether Müller and Ehlers hoped that their Latin compositions would meet with such critical appraisal among scholars as to be incorporated into the text, making them co-authors of the *Satyrice*?

ceived enigma of this ancient work of literature. Before we introduce further varieties into the already complex secondary scholarship, a method must be sought to give a brief overview of the modern schools of thought. In his narratological study of Apuleius' *Asinus Aureus* or *Metamorphoses*,⁴¹ Jack Winkler made the pragmatic suggestion that, in philological interpretation, another text, deemed by the scholar to be of primary importance for the correct understanding of the text under study—a sort of Rosetta stone to decode the main text—might in fact be the real determinant of the resulting interpretation. Such a “comparison text” can constitute everything from a part of a work, to a whole work, or even a cluster of texts associated with one another, according to some criterion, so as to form a single context. In fact, a specifically highlighted part of the main text under consideration, a fragment for example, is often used as the “comparison text”. Far from being secondary, this supposedly lateral and auxiliary text becomes the primary context in which the main body of text is read, at once a master-referent and a supplement. As Winkler persuasively demonstrated, distinct primary contexts in which the work of Apuleius had traditionally been read could readily account for the five interpretations that he listed as main contenders.

This clever idea is a handy tool to account for the three readings of the *Satyrica* which have long dominated scholarship on the work. A brief survey of the thrust of the main arguments associated with these three primary contexts will facilitate the plotting of the scholarly landscape. For reasons on which I shall further elaborate towards the end of this book, the readings show a rather obvious correlation to a triad of trends in the humanities at large: historicism, formalism (or “pure” philology), and the study of national literatures. The following, despite the matter-of-fact presentation, are intended as interpretive stances, rather than stated facts.

(i) *Testimonia*. The author of the *Satyrica* is commonly identified as the Roman consular Petronius who was a close associate of the emperor Nero, and whose coerced suicide Tacitus describes in a memorable passage of the *Annales* (16.17–19). Allegedly, at the hour of death, the *elegantiae arbiter* entertained himself with “light poems and easy verses” (*levia carmina et faciles versus*) and made it one of his last tasks to “write, sign and send to Nero a catalogue of his disgraceful passions, where under the names of debauched boys and women the novelty of each sexual act was described” (*flagitia principis sub nominibus exoletorum feminarumque et nouitatem cuiusque stupri perscripsit atque obsignata misit Neroni*). Tacitus and others

⁴¹ Winkler 1985, 7.

also inform us of Nero's disposition for secret explorations of the brothels and riotous nightlife of the capital. The *Satyrica* contains light poetry, it has a brothel scene, albeit fragmentary, and it is rich in explicit descriptions of orgies and riotous parties in Campania—where Petronius incidentally died in his villa—which are vivid enough to give the impression of first-hand experience. “One of its chief aims was to advance the author's standing in the court circle by appealing to the emperor's literary tastes,”⁴² while parodying the literary products of personages of the court circle, notably Lucan and Seneca, who were falling out of favor with Nero.⁴³

(ii) *Fragmenta*. The *Satyrica* contains a copious sample of poetry composed in numerous meters, some of which has been detached from the work and is now found in other sources as *loose Petronian poems*. From a separate manuscript tradition comes also the *Cena Trimalchionis*, a long description of a dinner party reminiscent of symposium literature. In addition, we find in the work several *rhetorical set pieces*; two short erotic narratives, so-called *Milesian tales*,⁴⁴ and many fragmentary farcical scenes, which in the text are explicitly compared to *mime* and *comic theater*. The fact that we can take such fragments of the *Satyrica* and break them out by genre indicates that the sum of its parts is no more than a “large framework, or container, into which [Petronius] could pour ... all the wealth of literary, philosophical, and artistic expression that was welling up within his fertile genius.”⁴⁵

(iii) *Asinus Aureus* or *Metamorphoses*. The *Satyrica* shares with the work of Apuleius a predilection for seemingly realistic and satirical descriptions of low life in regions of the Roman Empire. It so happens that much of the extant *Satyrica* is set in Campania, where two modern archeological sites,

⁴² Sullivan 1985b, 1666.

⁴³ I have listed this context first, because it is still the dominant one. In the English language scholarship, J. P. Sullivan's influential work, *The Satyricon of Petronius* (1968), is the best representative of this essentially historicist approach. Sullivan also prepared for publication posthumously the other fundamental text for this reading, K. F. C. Rose's 1971, *The Date and Author of the Satyricon*.

⁴⁴ According to a persistent misunderstanding of the term *Milesia* [*sc. historia sive fabula*], which does not, in fact, denote “short stories” or “novelle”; see further section 3.2.3.

⁴⁵ Ben Edwin Perry, *The Ancient Romances* (1967), 205. This reading was perhaps originated by Albert Collignon in his *Étude sur Pétron. La Critique littéraire, l'imitation et la parodie dans le Satyricon* (1892), but it was given its present and more dogmatic form by Martin Rosenblüth in his doctoral dissertation, *Beiträge zur Quellenkunde von Petrons Satiren* (1909). Rosenblüth treats the *Satyrica* only in pieces (*Stücken*) which he compares with various genres to support the claim that Petronius was an “original” artist and his work a “synthetic” composition.

Pompeii and *Herculaneum*, have greatly improved our knowledge of the material and linguistic (through *graffiti*) aspects of daily life in Roman Italy.⁴⁶ The two Roman novels are the only extant comic and satiric prose fictions from antiquity, and they can be seen to form a contrast with the extant sentimental Greek romance. Moreover, the peculiar mixture of prose and poetry in the *Satyrica* is the same as that used by Seneca in the *Apocolocyntosis*, a form introduced to Roman literature by Varro in his lost *Saturae Menippeae*. The genre of the *Satyrica* was therefore, as was said by Quintilian about hexameter satire, *tota nostra* for the Romans, and displayed a distinctly “native” or “national” genius—Müller calls it “der italische Wille zu individueller Gestaltung”⁴⁷—which can be seen to parody, amongst other things, a Greek penchant for the fabulous.⁴⁸ As a genre the Roman Comic Novel has found its *Nachleben* in the Spanish picaresque novel.⁴⁹

The three contexts above, all of which have a long-standing and well established relationship with the *Satyrica*, do not of course constitute a complete list; nor are they necessarily incompatible, since one regularly finds two or more used by the same interpreter, although with varying priority. All three are possible readings of the work. (I grant that my presentation of them may not show them in their best possible light.) What I wish to emphasize, however, is that whatever context we choose to put the *Satyrica* in as we read it—and for whatever reason—this context will influence, if not determine, our interpretation. This is especially true with respect to the vexed problem of finding a suitable generic label for our work.

A particularly interesting variation on the use of master contexts is found in two important book-length studies, *The Satyricon of Petronius* by J. P. Sullivan (1968) and *Reading Petronius* by Niall W. Slater (1990). In both

⁴⁶ The archeological context (Pompeian graffiti) was made use of first by Arminius von Guericke, *De linguae vulgaris reliquiis apud Petronium et in inscriptionibus parietariis Pompeianis* (1875), and more widely by Amedeo Maiuri, *La Cena di Trimalchione* (1945), who was the director of the archeological site at Pompeii.

⁴⁷ Müller 1983, 496. Theodor Mommsen 1878 is certainly the ideologue behind the crudest form of the nationalist interpretation of the *Satyrica*, which incidentally is only one aspect of his general attempt to read ancient Roman literature as “national” literature. See section 3.2.2.

⁴⁸ A by now classic example of this reading is P. G. Walsh’s *The Roman Novel* (1971, repr. 1995). Other works of major importance for this reading include Albert Collignon’s *Étude sur Pétrone* (1892), and Ettore Paratore’s two volume edition *Il Satyricon di Petronio* (1933).

⁴⁹ A recent development in Spanish studies, however, is the recognition of the positive critical reception of Heliodorus in the Renaissance, and his importance as a model for picaresque fiction in Golden Age Spain (Forcione 1970).

studies a programmatic statement is extracted from a short selected passage of the work itself. It is assumed that in this passage the author bypasses the “unreliable” persona of Encolpius to explain his true purposes in writing the work. Suddenly we are no longer in the proper context of the work, but have been transported into the historical context. As such the chosen passage is granted a categorically different status from the rest of the text and gives, so to speak, a green light from the author to the scholars to go ahead with a certain interpretation. If we consider closely what it is about these small bits of the whole work—in both cases we are dealing with a couple of elegiac distichs—that makes them susceptible to this reading, the reason appears to be the occurrence of the words *opus* (132.15), “deed” or “work”, in Sullivan’s passage,⁵⁰ and *pagina* (80.9), “page”, in Slater’s.⁵¹ Each term is understood by the respective scholar to designate the *Satyrica* itself. However, as the reader of the work will recall, the word *opus* (132.15) does not necessarily stand for the work as a whole, but is more naturally taken in the immediate context as reference to a comic oration addressed by Encolpius to his penis (132.8f.).⁵² The same is true of the word *pagina* (80.9), which does not necessarily designate a page in the *Satyrica*, but more obviously forms part of what we may loosely term “poetic circumlocution.” The phrase *ubi ridendas inclusit pagina partes*—“when the page closes upon the laughable roles” would be another way of saying “when the role-playing recitation ends.” The immediate context is Encolpius’ betrayal by his two friends and lovers, Giton and Ascyltos, leading him to a state of disillusionment which makes their friendship seem, retrospectively, a farce that has ended abruptly. Thus there is in both cases another possible reading, which does not require the peculiar allegorical hermeneutics used by these scholars. However, their two quite different readings are not really dependent on being correctly “authorized” by Petronius.⁵³ The present analysis merely transfers responsibility from Petronius to the real authors.

To escape the methodological dilemma of excessive reliance on privileged passages and context, I propose in principle to treat the whole text of the *Satyrica* itself as its own privileged context. Instead of searching for the

⁵⁰ Sullivan 1968, 98–99, is here under the influence of Heinz Stubbe 1933, 150–53, who like him considered the phrase “a work of simplicity” *simplicitatis opus* (132.15) a direct reference to the *Satyrica* and sought to support his argument by pointing out that *opus* could also mean “genre”, according to Quint. *Inst.* 10.1.67ff.

⁵¹ Slater 1990, 13.

⁵² This was pointed out by Beck 1973, 51.

⁵³ Sullivan’s reading is of the historicist type, whereas Slater’s is of the philologico-formalist variety with a strong emphasis on drama as the dominant genre in the “literary medley” that is, supposedly, the *Satyrica*.

“basic idea” of the work in another text or generic system of texts (history, epic, drama, satire, realistic novel, picaresque novel etc.), we look for it in the text itself. In the light of general claims about the uniqueness of our work, this ought to allow us to discover something which is not easily found elsewhere. Nevertheless, I do not intend to deprive my reading of external contexts, so long as they are kept secondary to the main text; nor can I guarantee that I shall give equal weight to every passage in the work. No reading can really take place in a contextual vacuum. The issue is not whether we read in context, but our choice of context, the quality of our intertextual analysis, what we do with the context and whether we properly respect textual boundaries. Hence the three traditional contexts and their implications for the reading of the *Satyricon* will often be referred to in this study, while new “comparison texts” will also be introduced to provide further contextual support to allow a revision of the traditional intertextual relationships, and thus to fully enable a new reading of the work.

1.1.3 Masks and Faces

The focus of my reading will inevitably be on how the person of the narrator tells his story, and how this story forms a coherent whole, meanwhile allowing the mysterious figure of the historical author to retire into the background, behind the mask where he originally chose to stay. Many scholars, on the contrary, seem to sense the authorial presence of Petronius behind the words of Encolpius, who is regularly described in terms such as “double” (Veyne), “puppet-actor” (Perry), “ambiguous” (Sullivan), or “chameleon” (Walsh). Slater even announces his discovery of “the absent presence of a narrator” which according to him is “the essence of Petronian comedy.”⁵⁴ What the paradoxical language seems to be telling us is not to recognize Encolpius as a person in his own right, but rather to watch in his every move for the signs of Petronius lurking behind a transparent mask. It may be questioned, however, whether a “transparent mask” is properly a disguise at all, for such a mask does not conceal the identifying signature of the face and substitute new features. In discussing artistic representation we conflate an important distinction—we risk losing sight of the important function of *mimesis*—if we allow degrees and transparency of identity, and speak of a person as “partly identical” to another. Although we are admittedly in proximity with perhaps the most difficult philosophical problem of modern times, the problem of the subject, from an anthropological point of view an explanation

⁵⁴ Slater 1990, 173.

for the ability to effect a change in identity through artistic representation rests on a complex convention agreed on by performers and audience alike. To avoid digressing into the anthropological aspect of the problem, we may simply describe the general cognitive act of identifying the representing “this” with the represented “that” through the compact formulation provided by Aristotle: οἷον ὅτι οὗτος ἐκεῖνος—“so that this one *is* that one” (1448b17).⁵⁵

Cast in pragmatic and textual terms, identities and proper names can be described as transitional signifiers, which carry us from one context to another. Suetonius relates the following anecdote about Nero, the performer, which illustrates well the semantic and contextual power of identity.

[Nero] sang tragedies wearing the masks of heroes and gods, and even of heroines and goddesses, having the masks fashioned in the likeness of his own features or those of the women of whom he chanced to be enamored. Among other themes he sang ‘Canace in Labor’, ‘Orestes the Matricide,’ ‘The Blinding of Oedipus’ and ‘The frenzy of Hercules.’ At the last named performance they say that a freshman recruit, placed as soldier on guard at the entrance, upon seeing the emperor in mean attire and bound with chains, as the plot demanded, rushed forward to lend him aid.⁵⁶

Critics who refuse to take Encolpius at face value risk making the mistake of the young recruit. They break the spell of fiction and ruin the effort of the artist. It is true that, in Suetonius’ anecdote above, Nero is deliberately playing a game with identities by having the male masks made in his own likeness and the female masks in the likeness of a favorite mistress, but Nero’s conviction that his exceptional status in the world put him on par with heroes and deities did not alter the fact that his unhappy identification could not be accommodated within the context of the myth of Hercules.⁵⁷ It is all very

⁵⁵ See Nagy 1989, 47. A useful discussion of masks as identities in performance is provided by Calame 1995, 97–115, who also supplies ample references to the relevant anthropological and semiotic literature.

⁵⁶ Suet. *Nero* 21, *Tragoedias quoque cantavit personatus heroum deorumque, item heroidum ac dearum, personis effectis ad similitudinem oris sui et feminae, prout quamque diligeret. inter cetera cantavit Canacem parturientem, Oresten matricidam, Oedipodem excaecatam, Herculem insanum. in qua fabula fama est tirunculum militem positum ad custodiam aditus, cum eum ornari ac vinciri catenis, sicut argumentum postulabat, videret, accurrisse feren-dae opis gratia.*

⁵⁷ Nero’s playfulness in the performance of Hercules says more about the performer than it does about the story of Hercules itself, just as Curiatius Maternus’ passionate impersonation

well to have the Greco-Roman hero dressed in mean attire and bound with chains “as the plot demanded” (*sicut argumentum postulabat*), but that is no way to treat the man who bears the supreme identity of Caesar. The young military recruit, by virtue of his youth and the values of state which he had imbibed through his military training, possessed the kind of *simplicitas* that was valued at Rome. So *simplex* was he that he read everything in the same context, the official context of Rome. His inability to restrain himself from rushing to Caesar’s aid has the effect of valorizing the context of Nero as Caesar, and making unreadable the context of Nero as Hercules. This is the point of Suetonius’ anecdote, for the imperial biographer’s agenda is also to privilege the official context, and to condemn the man Nero for his unstately theatrical escapades while in the office of the Roman emperor.⁵⁸

Classical authors and storytellers have always known how to exploit the semantic magic of personal identities. Recognition scenes in Greek literature are based on the principle that identity is key to the meaning of words said and deeds done, as Sophocles’ play, *Oedipus Rex*, so cleverly dramatizes. On a smaller and less artistic scale, we have seen earlier how the words *opus* (132.15) and *pagina* (80.9) in the *Satyrica* are given an entirely different range of reference, depending on who is “recognized” as their source. The unhappy *anagnorismos* of the historical author as the speaker of those words is enough to annihilate their immediate context and replace them in another context appropriate to the person of Petronius. Reading the *Satyrica* as a statement by Petronius is disruptive of the story, even if some of “the masks were fashioned in the likeness” of historical personages.

What historicists accomplish by reading Petronius and his emperor friend into the *Satyrica* is to read the text in the primary context of the *testimonia*, without respecting the boundary between text and context. What remains of these historical personages is made of written “text”, the same material as the *Satyrica*. By “recognizing” Petronius in Encolpius we indiscriminately fuse the *Annales* with the *Satyrica*. Such contextual fusion does admittedly have an illustrious pedigree. Ancient Greco-Roman grammarians, it seems, invented the allegorical hermeneutics of the historico-biographical reading. Servius’ readings of Virgil’s *Eclogues*—short personal narratives some of them—recognized and identified the communiqués of Virgil on the subject of his own life and times in the words of shepherds and goatherds

of Cato, in reciting his historical tragedy, revealed something about his own political stance, i.e. that he had adopted that of Cato; the ideas of Cato himself were well known before (Tac. *Dial.* 2.1). We should distinguish between specific interpretive performances and the general requirements of the story that its own logic be respected.

⁵⁸ Cf. also D.C. 63.9.4ff.

with names like Meliboeus and Corydon.⁵⁹ We will encounter further samples of this style of criticism as this study progresses, for most of the *Satyrice*'s external fragments come in the awkward wrappings of the grammar school.

Paul Veyne was perhaps the first late modern scholar to address directly the problem of identity in the *Satyrice*. He summarizes his conclusions thus: "dans la *Cena*, Encolpe est le porte-parole de Pétrone, dans le reste du roman, il est son alibi et lui permet de prendre ses distances sur le genre mineur qu'il pratique."⁶⁰ It is hard to resist the thought that Veyne's arbitrary splitting of Encolpius' person might be motivated by some institutional sense of propriety. Petronius' ventriloquial narration of Trimalchio's dinner party—through the dummy Encolpius—is tolerable, because in this, the least obscene part of the story, the protagonist is represented as aloof, while the narrator increasingly expresses a critical and mocking attitude towards the tasteless *parvenus*. However, in the rest of the story, where shameless obscenities fly thick and fast from the mouth of the narrator, the Roman consular Petronius must be seen to take appropriate distance, and moral responsibility is left with the dummy.

The most recent attempt to salvage the Petronian presence in the words of Encolpius is Gian Biagio Conte's 1995 Sather Lectures published under the title *The Hidden Author: An Interpretation of Petronius's Satyricon*. Conte's lectures contain an excellent description of the strange literary and cultural pathology infecting the world of the *Satyrice* but they fail, in my view, to accomplish their titular project of elucidating the *nexus* between narrator Encolpius and his absent or "hidden" author. In Romantic and post-Romantic literary criticism, subscribed to by Conte in the preface, a work of literature is "intended" as the expression of an author's subjective sensibility. However, if the author is not there in the text, as Conte argues for the *Satyrice*—a premise which has been gaining acceptance since it was first proposed by Roger Beck in 1973⁶¹—and if getting at the author's intention nevertheless "is the only way of retrieving the overall meaning of the text",⁶² it follows that the meaning of the text is in fact irretrievable and just as "hidden" as the author. But Conte does not give up this easily and instead over-

⁵⁹ On autobiographical fallacy in criticism of bucolic poetry, see Reed 1997, 49. For something analogous in modern Petronian scholarship, see Rose's 1971, 55, suggestion that Petronius was educated and spent his youth in Massalia. Slater 1990, 10, accepts the suggestion.

⁶⁰ Veyne 1961, 301.

⁶¹ Beck 1973, 42–61.

⁶² Conte 1996, viii.

comes the *aporia* with metaphysics of intentionality that could be termed transcendental. It happens in a few subtle “moves” that are taken gradually and must be tracked down in order to be fully comprehended. First, Conte interprets the author’s absence as his passive aggressive intention, “[a]s a deliberate strategy, the author refuses to play a direct role in the account, preferring to make himself a detached external observer, like the reader whose complicity he is seeking”.⁶³ Thus “[a]lerted by Petronius, the reader interprets the text in open conflict with the way in which the narrating character perceives and reports it”,⁶⁴ and then “assumes for himself the ironizing attitude of the author”, until “[t]he reader’s smile ... makes explicit the author’s implicit voice, a voice that would otherwise be bound to silence in a text in which the narrator’s “I” ostensibly conducts the entire narration”.⁶⁵ Finally, the reader (Conte himself) is empowered to speak on behalf of the author, revealing the “hidden” intention behind the *Satyrice*.⁶⁶ Thus, it doesn’t really matter that the author is “hidden”, absent from the text, or even dead, as the poststructuralists would say; his intention has been transmitted to the next of kin, his authoritative reader. Predictably, *Petronius redivivus*, alias Conte the reader, is stuck in the familiar time warp of Petronian scholarship and endorses most of the theories about him by the German philologists who invented him over a century ago (see section 3.2.2).

As Philippe Lejeune, the French theorist of autobiography, concedes with respect to his concept of *le pacte autobiographique*,⁶⁷ there exists no method to distinguish between autobiography and the autobiographical novel on the basis of internal textual evidence: “[A]ll narrative in the first person implies that the protagonist, even if some distant adventures about him are being told, is at the same time the *real* person who produces the narration.”⁶⁸ What defines the status of the personal narrative with respect to the external world is merely the identity or lack thereof of the writer’s proper name, on the title page, and the name of the narrator and protagonist, in the narrative.

An infamous case involving the learned Byzantine scholar Photios provides an excellent illustration of Lejeune’s point.⁶⁹ Photios had two Greek Ass-Stories in front of him, a *Μεταμορφώσεις* in several volumes, and a

⁶³ Conte 1996, 26–7.

⁶⁴ Conte 1996, 29.

⁶⁵ Conte 1996, 73–4.

⁶⁶ Conte 1996, 150.

⁶⁷ ‘Le Pacte autobiographique’ (orig. edn. 1975); translated in Lejeune 1989, 3–30.

⁶⁸ Lejeune 1989, 25.

⁶⁹ Phot. *Bibl. Cod.* 129. My discussion of this passage is inspired by Winkler’s 1985, 253–255.

Λούκιος ἢ Ὑονος in a single book. They were both the narratives of Loukios of Patrai, and γέμει δὲ ὁ ἑκατέρου λόγος πλασμάτων μὲν μυθικῶν, ἀρρητοποιίας δὲ αἰσχρᾶς—“each was stuffed with fabulous stories and shameless obscenity.” Judging from internal textual evidence the only notable difference was the length. Photios seemed hesitant whether to declare the shorter an abbreviation of the longer or the longer an expansion of the shorter (the shorter happens to be still extant, but the longer is lost). However, he was convinced that Lucian had written the shorter version and was equally certain that Loukios of Patrai—Photios calls him ἄλλος Λουκιανός, “another Lucian”—had written the longer version. This information may have been derived from the title pages of the MSS to which Photios had access.⁷⁰ Bearing in mind the two authorial identities for virtually the same story (whether the shorter was an abbreviation of the longer or the longer an expansion of the shorter, the difference was only in detail and length), Photios interprets the intention of each writer thus:

ὁ μὲν Λουκιανὸς σκώπτων καὶ διασύρων τὴν δεισιδαιμονίαν, ὥσπερ κἂν τοῖς ἄλλοις, καὶ τοῦτον συνέταπτεν. ὁ δὲ Λούκιος σπουδάζων τε καὶ πιστάς νομίζων τὰς ἐξ ἀνθρώπων εἰς ἀλλήλους μεταμορφώσεις τὰς τε ἐξ ἀλόγων εἰς ἀνθρώπους καὶ ἀνάπαλιν καὶ τὸν ἄλλον τῶν παλαιῶν μύθων ὕθλον καὶ φλήγαρον

Lucian designed his work to mock and ridicule Greek superstitions, as he does in his other writing, whereas Loukios in all seriousness believed in transformations of one human being into another, and into animals and back again, and the other nonsensical babble of ancient myths.

The same story means two different things according to whose name is on the title page, i.e., according to whether the naïve *persona* of Loukios is taken at his word, or whether there is a notorious jester hiding behind the mask, making the words of the simple *persona* acquire a double meaning.

The significant moment is when Photios points to what Lucian “does in his other works”. This contextual reference transports the ass-story into the context of Lucian’s other works and gives it a similar meaning. Without that context, and without the proper name of Lucian on the title page, Loukios is king of his story. In fact, despite many brave attempts, modern scholars have not been able to determine with certainty whether Loukios of Patrai, the author of the *Μεταμορφώσεις*, is also a character in the master-context of *res*

⁷⁰ For a possible title-page with the name of Loukios of Patrai, see Mason 1994, 1669, n.16.

gestae, the historical context, or merely existed in the text of his personal story.⁷¹ Likewise, if we had no information about who wrote the *Satyrice*, we might well be debating today whether Encolpius, a Latin speaking *Graeculus*, actually existed, and if so, what he intended by his autobiographical narrative.

Fortunately, this is not the case and it seems, indeed, possible to determine with certainty that Encolpius is not a character in the historical context. The reason is that another's signature is found on the edge of the work. This edge, unlike the text itself, overlaps with the historical context. Provided we recognize the author designated by the name of Petronius Arbiter, as the Tacitean consular Caius Petronius, who played the role of *elegantiae arbiter* for Nero, we have a legitimate reason to dip the edge of the *Satyrice* into a vast ocean of historical context. But let us remember, no more than the edge. "Petronius Arbiter" and "Encolpius" are two different proper names embedded in two distinct contexts, each standing on the opposite side of the boundary between history and fiction.

But what, then, somebody may protest, of the oft noted similarity between the historical Petronius and the protagonist Encolpius, e.g., their mutual quality of *simplicitas* in word and deed—which Tacitus in fact suspects to be *faux* in his Petronius?⁷² This quality has sometimes been used as a ground to identify the two men. However, estimating the similarity between two objects is only possible by measuring the extent to which they both share the quality of some third object or principle which links them, and so the establishment of similarity constitutes a different cognitive act from that of identification.⁷³ In this case the mutual element is *simplicitas*, a quality shared by both figures, although not of course exclusive to the pair of them.

Scholars have sometimes recognized in Tacitus' thanatography of Caius Petronius a quotation from *Sat.* 132.15.⁷⁴ The thesis of Tacitus "quoting"

⁷¹ For a survey and extensive bibliography of the scholarship on the Greek and Roman Ass-tories, see Mason 1994, 1665–1707. Apuleius clearly did not take Loukios of Patrai to be a historical person as is shown by his preserving Loukios/Lucius as a narrator of his *Metamorphoses*. He even changes the narrator's biography, makes him get involved with the cult of Isis and Osiris and move to Rome to become an advocate in the courts there. This is not the manner in which to treat some one's actual biography.

⁷² Tac. *Ann.* 16.18.

⁷³ The essential difference between similarity and identity in the classical context is discussed by Trimpi 1983, 166–75.

⁷⁴ 132.15, "*quid me constricta spectatis fronte Catones / damnatisque novae simplicitatis opus? / Sermonis puri non tristis gratia ridet, / quodque facit populus, candida lingua refert*" ("Why look at me frowning, you Catos, and condemn a deed of new simplicity? It is the grace of pure not pompous language that smiles; whatever people do my candid

Petronius would be proven, if all three of the following conditions were fully satisfied: i) the identification of the two Petronii is correct in the historical context; ii) Tacitus knew and had read the *Satyrica*, at least as far as book sixteen, assuming he started from the beginning; iii) from the vast text of the original, Tacitus picked out a single word from a single poem, which he recognized as the direct communiqué and programmatic statement of Petronius, anticipating Heinz Stubbe (1933) by almost two millennia.

But let us grant, for the sake of argument, that all three conditions have been satisfied. The consequences are not encouraging for those who had hoped to find the historical Petronius, since we would have to declare him contaminated by context with the *Satyrica*'s wanton characters. For we must ask to what extent the reading of at least sixteen books of the lascivious *Satyrica* inspired Tacitus' bizarre account of Petronius, who had been dead for over half a century when the section was penned?⁷⁵ We must ask how much of Encolpius has found its way into the character delineation of Petronius? Instead of historicizing Encolpius, we may end up fictionalizing Petronius.

The counter-intuitive argument that I have made in this introductory investigation can be summarized thus: The *Satyrica* means one thing if Encolpius is identified as the speaker, and it means something entirely different if we identify the speaker as Petronius, for the simple reason that different contexts come into play in these distinct readings. At this moment in the reception-history of the work we have accumulated countless readings on the authority of Petronius, this having been the subject of "Petronian scholarship".⁷⁶ Rarely has the person of the narrator and protagonist been taken seriously enough for there to have been an interpretation of the *Satyrica* on the authority of Encolpius; this is therefore what we shall try to accomplish in the present study.

We will proceed from considerations of the contextual links that have been forged between the *Satyrica* and other works—in several places attempting to revise the traditional readings by re-interpreting old "comparison texts" and introducing new ones—to analysis of the proper context of the work, the whole extant text of the *Satyrica*. By focusing on the figure of the narrator at various levels of analysis ("performance", "discourse", "story", "narrative" and "genre") the re-integration of the fragments is brought about through

tongue relates.") Bogner 1941, 223–4; and Rankin 1971, 106–8.

⁷⁵ Caius Petronius died in 66, and according to Syme 1958, 473, "nothing forbids the assumption that Tacitus was writing as late as 120, or even 123." The chapter about Petronius comes in the antepenultimate year of the *Annales*, Tacitus' last work.

⁷⁶ Beck 1973 and 1975 is an exception to the rule.

recognizing the source of the whole in a single voice. In this mimetic and desultory voice, moreover, one encounters multiple impersonations and a roster of traditional moods and generic stances providing diverse impacts at different moments in the story. All autobiographical narratives imply that the person who produces the narration is as real as the protagonist himself, and, although the *Satyrice* has traditionally been read in historical context as the narrative of Petronius, the proper name and person of Encolpius distinguishes him from the author and provides the dominant organizing principle in the context of the story.

Part One analyses the act of narrating the *Satyrice*, as opposed to the story told in the narrative, which will be treated in Part Two. The implications of the three traditional contexts on the question of performance are discussed and a new model of the performance is advanced. This new model is used to account for such features of the work as the subordinate narrators, the colloquial language and the variety of discourse types. Finally, we relate the critical and esthetic questions raised by the characters in the story to the plurality of form in the whole of the *Satyrice*.

Part Two attempts to reconstruct the story and logic of the “recollections” of Encolpius on the basis of the preserved text. As an aid to the reconstruction, the linear progression of Encolpius’ travelogue will be used to map allusions in the extant text and the fragments onto the topographical grid of the story. In section 2.2, this reconstructive work will be continued with a special emphasis on the utterances of young Encolpius in soliloquies and *colloquia personarum*, where much of the information about lost parts of the *Satyrice* occurs. Special emphasis will be placed on refuting the attempts of scholars to trivialize the significance of this important material. Section 2.3 contains a detailed creative summary or *argumentum* of my findings, to represent in as concise a manner as possible the proper context of the *Satyrice*. The summary, which itself is in the narrative form of a personal “recollection”, draws on the conclusions of the two preceding chapters, and aims at showing the conventionality of the plot compared to other ancient erotic fictions.

Section 3.1 provides a new definition of the genre of the *Satyrice* based on the narrative form, and a critique of the current idea of the work as simultaneous narrative, by establishing a categorical difference in the temporal and cognitive status of the protagonist, on the one hand, and narrator on the other, as seen in the slow progress of the protagonist from ignorance to knowledge, in contrast to the narrator’s complete knowledge of the story, as demonstrated by his ability to narrate it. This section also analyses the “moral message” of the genre, and Encolpius’ social and moral status with

respect to his audience, which determines his comic narrative stance and puts constraints on the manner in which he can deliver his satire.

Section 3.2 finally attempts to place the *Satyrica* in the literary-historical context. By surveying the early modern scholarship on the work, we conclude that contemporary ideologies exerted an influence on the scholarship, to the detriment of our understanding, and that a revision of the belief in Petronius' "Italian" characteristics and "originality" is called for, especially in view of recent discoveries of Greek papyri which show close affinity of tone and form with the *Satyrica*. Revisiting the camp of the apparently defeated traditionalists among late nineteenth-century German scholars, we restate their case, and supplement earlier arguments with new ones of our own making.

1.2 The Desultory Voice of Encolpius

1.2.1 Narrative through Impersonation

The ancient philosophical and rhetorical theory of narrative, though often neglected by classicists and literary critics alike, arguably offers better tools for the study of ancient narration and narrators than does the modern discipline of narratology. The ultimate reason for its excellence lies in the different goals and practices of ancient literary production. While the ancient theorists were attempting to explain a literature composed for vocal reading and public delivery, modern narratologists have naturally seen their task as that of studying printed texts read silently by a solitary reader. These pragmatic differences are reflected in the usage of terminology and central paradigms.⁷⁷ For the ancient rhetoricians the person producing the narrative, and the circumstances surrounding that production, are always primary, whether it is the author or a fictional narrator, while the modern approach tends to privilege the story, and attempts to work backwards from it to the narrator, building a complex typology of narrators based on their connection with the characters of the story.

An early and problematic formulation in modern narratology regards the use of the grammatical person as the basis to establish a typology of narrators. The terms “first person narrator” and “third person narrator” derive from such early formulations. Petronian scholarship has made use of the modern terminology, apologetically, at least from the end of the nineteenth century.⁷⁸ However, as most narratologists have come to understand, the grammatical first person as such does not mark a narrator in any but the most generic way, i.e., as “the speaker”. All speakers can refer to themselves by using the first person, and its mere articulation does not change in the least the status of the discourse. Without further information the linguistic sign,

⁷⁷ The ancient technical terms often derive from the theater (e.g., *persona*, “mask”); the modern are often borrowed from formal grammar (e.g., “first person narrative”) or the criticism of painting and photography (e.g., “point of view”).

⁷⁸ Klebs 1889, 631f, “[i]n den erhaltenen Stücken erzählt überall Encolpios in der ersten Person [...] Wir dürfen demnach mit Bestimmtheit sagen, daß das Ganze, um den nicht eben schönen, aber gebräuchlichen modernen Ausdruck anzuwenden, in der Form des Ich-Romans gehalten war” [my underlining].

“I”, is devoid of identity. The difference between so-called “first person narratives” and “third person narratives” results from the identification, or lack thereof, of the narrator as a principal character of the story. In so-called “first person narratives”, which usually take the form of recollections, we can distinguish between two meanings of the first person: “I” the speaker, and “I” the protagonist. Although terminology is not of paramount importance (so long as we understand the crucial features of the form) a better way to refer to such narratives might be to call them, as I have already done above, “personal” recollections.⁷⁹

The advantage of the ancient rhetorical theory is perhaps most obvious in the way it accounts for the narrative phenomenon of utterance within utterance. Modern narratology, because it privileges the story, must treat the second discourse as “quotation”, i.e., as a practically autonomous speech act, which existed prior to its later quotation by the narrator during the telling of the story. Rhetorical theory, on the other hand, since it uses paradigms from performance literature, casts the problem as a question of identity, *persona*. And so the difference between the main discourse and the discourse within that discourse becomes a matter of mimetic change in the identity of the speaker.⁸⁰ *Mimesis* as impersonation, or *sermocinatio*, unlike the modern idea of “quotation”, is mostly indifferent to concerns about historicity or *verbatim* accuracy of the utterance, which it tends to replace with qualitative criteria such as the appropriateness and aptness of the speech with respect to the speaker and the circumstances when the words were uttered.⁸¹ Another

⁷⁹ This term bears a superficial resemblance to the terminology of Stanzel 1964, “der personale Roman”, followed by Effé 1975 with some reservation. But Stanzel’s “personal” novel is modern (late nineteenth century) and is characterized by the apparent absence of a narrator, i.e., an impersonal narrative stance. This is because Stanzel, like many modern narratologists, sees only the characters as *personae*, behind whom the author in his “personal” type somehow hides by means of a scenic presentation, and Stanzel accordingly fails to consider the narrator as the central narrative *persona*.

⁸⁰ Arist. *Po.* 1448a, μιμῆσθαι ἔστιν ... ἀπαγγέλλοντα ἕτερόν τι γιγνόμενον (“mimesis is ... when the narrator becomes some one else”); Isid. *Etym.* 2.21.32, *ethopoeia est, cum sermonem ex aliena persona inducimur* (“ethopoeia is when we introduce speech from a person other than ourselves”); Hermog. *Prog.* 9, ἠθοποιία ἔστι μίμησις ἡθους ὑποκειμένου προσώπου, οἷον τίνος ἂν εἴποι λόγους Ἀνδρομάχη ἐπὶ Ἑκτορι (“ethopoeia is an imitation [mimesis] of the manners of an assumed person, for example words that Andromache might say to Hector”).

⁸¹ Prisc. *Praeex.* 9, *ubique autem servanda est proprietates personarum et temporum: alia sunt enim verba iuvenis, alia senis, alia gaudentis, alia dolentis ... habeat autem stilum suppositis aptum personis* (“One must everywhere maintain the suitability of persons and times: the words of a young man are different from those of an old man, those of a happy man still something else, and those of a grieving man ... let the style suit the assumed person”); Isid.

modern concept, “embedded” narrative, likewise gives the impression that the secondary discourse had a prior existence as an autonomous statement, and was only later incorporated into the main discourse. Since this is neither true of fictional narratives, nor of ancient historiography, the advantages of the ancient model are obvious.

According to extant rhetorical manuals, *sermocinatio*, or speech within speech, is a stylistic device related to “vividness”, *evidentia* or ἐνάργεια, and may be classified among figures of speech, which contribute to the emotional impact of narrative.⁸² Although it is at times possible to provide such detailed verbal descriptions of characters and events that the reader or listener may experience the illusion of almost “seeing” what in fact is being read or listened to, in truth, the only thing that language is capable of fully representing is language. Accordingly, the greatest sense of presence in narrative is not created through the abundant description of details, and *translatio temporum* (the use of the present for the past tense), but effected by direct speech in the person of a character. This figure also aims to fuse past and present, or represent utterances from the past as present utterances. Because such statements effectively exist simultaneously in the past and in the present, they act out the past and stand in for it, as it were, in the present.

For the reasons explained above, ancient theorists had little need for developing comprehensive typologies of narrative based on the narrator’s relationship with the characters of the story. However, a few crucial distinctions were made, which could serve as the basis for a limited system of theoretical classification. Especially interesting to us is a type of narrative which is expressly said to be a separate functional class from narratives used in public speeches.⁸³ This literary *narratio* is subdivided into two types, one of which is marked by the occurrence of alterations in speaker identity: *eius narrationis duo sunt genera: unum quod in negotiis, alterum quod in per-*

Etym. 2.14.2, *in quo genere dictionis illa sunt maxime cogitanda, quis loquatur et apud quem, de quo et ubi, et quo tempore; quid egerit, quid acturus sit, aut quid pati possit, si haec consulta neglexerit* (“in this type of discourse one should primarily keep in mind, who is speaking and to whom, about what and where, and at what time; what he has done, what he is about to do, or what could happen to him, if he should disregard the deliberations”).

⁸² Quint. *Inst.* 9.2.58, *imitatio morum alienorum, quae ἠθοποιία vel, ut alii malunt, μίμησις dicitur, iam inter leniores affectus numerari potest* (“the imitation of the manners of others, which is called *ethopoeia* or, as some prefer, *mimesis*, can be counted among the milder affects of discourse”).

⁸³ Cic. *de inv.* 1.19.17, *tertium genus [sc. narrationis] remotum a civilibus causis* (“a third type of narration is unconnected with public issues”); *Rhet. Her.* 1.8.12, *tertium genus est id, quod a causa civili remotum est* (“a third type is that which is unconnected with public issues”).

sonis positum est (“there are two types of this narrative: one which consists in events, another which consists in persons”).⁸⁴ The distinction may be more theoretical than practical, since most narratives involve at least some impersonation or direct speech, *oratio recta*, but since the feature is adduced as the distinct characteristic of the class one may at least assume that what is meant is narrative which makes extensive use of the device. The type is further defined as *illa narratio quae versatur in personis*—“that type of narrative which employs persons/masks.”⁸⁵ According to Cicero, who so describes it, one can recognize therein, in addition to the “matter”, *res*, of the story, the “utterances”, *sermones*, and through them the “minds”, *animi*, of the *personae*. The idea of narrative in rhetorical theory, it goes without saying, is based on the paradigm of a single speaker, a single speaking voice.

In order to show the presence of the same basic structure in the narrative of the *Satyrica*, we need to demonstrate how exactly Encolpius, the teller of the story, manages to be the only speaker throughout the work, and how he impersonates all the other characters. In doing this, our aim is to read the *Satyrica* not as modern narratologists but as ancient rhetorical theorists. There seems to be no better method to demonstrate this than to go briefly through the extant text to mark the points at which Encolpius speaks as if he were someone else. To avoid making this an excessively long sequence (since the point of the demonstration is only to establish a model of the *Satyrica*'s narrative structure according to ancient principles), we include only major passages of impersonation while many shorter utterances are left out.

In the following sequence the proper names may be thought of as verbal equivalents of masks (the narrator is marked by caps., ENCOLPIUS, even in minimal bridges crossing from one impersonation to another, but the impersonated masks by quotation marks, e.g., “Quartilla”). By accident, the extant *Satyrica* opens in the middle of a passage where the narrator is impersonating his younger self, a character in the story, as he spoke at that moment in the past, after which the central identity resurfaces and so on and so forth:

[...] “Encolpius” — ENCOLPIUS (3.1) — “Agamemnon” — ENCOLPIUS (6.1–17.3) — “Quartilla” — ENCOLPIUS (18.1–37.1) — “Hermeros” — ENCOLPIUS (39.1) — “Trimalchio” — ENCOLPIUS (40.1–42.1) — “Seleucus” — ENCOLPIUS (43.1) — “Phileros” — ENCOLPIUS (44.1) — “Ganymedes” — ENCOLPIUS (45.1) — “Echion” — ENCOLPIUS (47.1) — “Trimalchio” — ENCOLPIUS (47.7–50.4) —

⁸⁴ *Rhet. Her.* 1.8.13

⁸⁵ *Cic. Inv.* 1.27.

“Trimalchio” — ENCOLPIUS (52.4–55.4) — “Trimalchio” — ENCOLPIUS (56.7–57.1) — “Hermeros” — ENCOLPIUS (59.1–61.5) — “Niceros” — ENCOLPIUS (63.1) — “Trimalchio” — ENCOLPIUS (64.1–65.9) — “Habinnas” — ENCOLPIUS (67.2–71.5) — “Trimalchio” — ENCOLPIUS (72.1–74.13) — “Trimalchio” — ENCOLPIUS (78.1–81.2) — “Encolpius” — ENCOLPIUS (82.1–83.7) — “Eumolpus” — ENCOLPIUS (90.1–101.9) — “Eumolpus” — ENCOLPIUS (102.10) — “Encolpius” — ENCOLPIUS (102.14) — “Giton” — ENCOLPIUS (103.3–106.4) — “Eumolpus” — ENCOLPIUS (107.7) — “Lichas” — ENCOLPIUS (107.12–108.14) — “Tryphaena” — ENCOLPIUS (109.1–110.8) — “Eumolpus” — ENCOLPIUS (113.1–115.9) — “Encolpius” — ENCOLPIUS (115.20–116.3) — “vilicus quidam” — ENCOLPIUS (117.1–13) — “Eumolpus” — ENCOLPIUS (124.2–125.4) — “Chrysis” — ENCOLPIUS (126.8–129.3) — “Circe” — ENCOLPIUS (129.10–12) — “Encolpius” — ENCOLPIUS (130.7–132.9) — “Encolpius” — ENCOLPIUS (132.11–12) — “Encolpius” — ENCOLPIUS (133.1–2) — “Encolpius” — ENCOLPIUS (133.4–134.10) — “Oenothra” — ENCOLPIUS (135.1–138.5) — “Encolpius” — ENCOLPIUS (139.3–141.1) — “Eumolpus” [...].

The identity of the main speaker (ENCOLPIUS in the schema above) is not on the same footing as the subordinate masks that he dons. From the modern perspective, the difference lies in the fact that the speakers of the shorter discourses within the main discourse also feature as narrated characters in the main story, whereas the reverse is not true. The actions of these characters are related by the narrator and speech is assigned to them, either by oblique reference or by his speaking on their behalf, each in turn. From the ancient perspective, these utterances *in personis* are therefore not autonomous units, or in any way primary to the narrative itself, but can be interpreted only with respect to the context in which they appear. We only need to translate them into indirect speech, *oratio obliqua*, which does not involve impersonation, to understand how integral they are to the narrative of the *Satyrica* as a whole.

It may seem strange to argue that Encolpius, himself a *persona*, can impersonate other *personae*, but such is the regular ancient understanding of the term. Cicero illustrates the type of narrative that operates through impersonation by quoting a *dramatis persona* from the *Adelphi* (60–64) of Terence impersonating another *dramatis persona* of that same play.⁸⁶ Here the use-

⁸⁶ Cic. *Inv.* 1.27; cf. Quint. *Inst.* 9.2.58. Cicero’s example can be a little confusing, because he has taken the expositional speech of Micio (over 80 lines long), which opens the first act of

fulness of the concept of mask is obvious, if correctly understood, for it emphasizes the change in identity, but does not seek to keep track schematically of all the possible identities involved in order to establish a complete theoretical hierarchy of identities; nor does it insist on a distinction between real and fictive *personae*. Thus the term *persona* allows us to treat historical authors and fictional narrators in the same way (the term *persona* was commonly used of people outside the theatrical or rhetorical context). As we showed above (in our example of Photios reading the two Greek Ass-Stories) such a distinction would not have a basis in any internal textual evidence. This simple method of accounting for discourse within discourse makes unproblematic further impersonations by impersonated characters, of which there is plenty in the *Satyrica*; just as Encolpius can speak in the person of himself as youth, he can also make his youthful self utter phrases in the person of a bombastic declaimer (1.1).

The central speaker identity of Encolpius is the basis of the *Satyrica*'s thematic and formal unity. If the voices of the subordinate personae were truly the voices of others, and not simply the voice of Encolpius imitating the characters of his story, there wouldn't be any organizing intelligence behind the *Satyrica*. The reason we for example get a Cynic rejection of literature in the speech of the semi-literate Echion and a Cynic rejection of philosophy in the epitaph of the culturally snobbish, albeit ignorant, Trimalchio, is that this is what the disillusioned littérateur Encolpius has on his mind.⁸⁷ As to formal unity, if we follow the example of some modern narratologists and treat as primary the utterances of the characters and the events of the story, we cannot, for instance, account for such phenomena as the strange poetic utterance of Tryphaena (108.13–109.1), which at first appears to have been spoken by her in hexameters, but is then introduced by the narrator in the middle of the first line with the *verbum dicendi*, "exclamat".

[Tryphaena] protendit ramum oleae a tutela navigii raptum, atque in colloquium venire ausa

‘quis furor’ *exclamat* ‘pacem convertit in arma?
quid nostrae meruere manus? non Troius heros
hac in classe vehit decepti pignus Atridae,
nec Medea furens fraterno sanguine pugnat.

the play, as an example of *narratio*, although by definition a play as a whole is not narrative.

⁸⁷ 46.7, "*nam litteris satis inquinatus est*" ("The boy is tainted enough as it is with literature"); 71.12, "*nec unquam philosophum audivit*" ("He never heard a philosopher lecture").

sed contemptus amor vires habet. ei mihi, fata
 hos inter fluctus quis raptis evocat armis?
 cui non est mors una satis? ne vincite pontum
 gurgitibusque feris alios immittite fluctus.’
 haec ut turbato clamore mulier effudit, haesit paulisper acies, revo-
 cataeque ad pacem manus intermisere bellum.

“Tryphaena held out an olive-branch from the ship’s figurehead, and dared to come up and talk to us:

“What madness,” *she shouted*, “is converting peace into war?
 What have we done to deserve this? No Trojan hero
 carries away in this fleet the spouse of the cuckold son of Atreus.
 No Medea fights here driven mad by her brother’s blood.
 But rejected love has violent impulses. Ah! Who was it then
 that took up arms and summoned the fates on these waves?
 For whom is one death not enough? Do not outdo the sea
 and heap waves of blood upon its savage floods.”

The woman poured out these words in a loud excited voice, the battle line hesitated for a while; summoned back to peace we dropped the war.

The peculiarity of this particular passage was noted by Michael Coffey,⁸⁸ and not long ago remarked upon extensively by Slater, who acknowledges that from his modern standpoint the speech of Tryphaena “raises a unique difficulty with regard to its status as utterance.” After several attempts to account for it within the narrative of Encolpius as *verbatim* quotation, Slater eventually considers the possibility that it may not after all be a quotation. However, he immediately rejects this as unacceptable since “[i]f Encolpius is so unreliable a narrator that we find him altering direct speech he is supposedly reporting, how shall we find our way out of the resulting solipsism?”⁸⁹ This anxiety at discovering the power of the story-teller to give verbal form to the story seems quite modern, since for the ancient theorist of narrative the principal paradigms of rhetorical delivery and theatrical performance made it less problematic to assume that the actual words of any narrative, including utterances *in personis*, could well originate entirely with the narrator. The ancient theory is sounder since it is more generally applicable.⁹⁰ The labyrin-

⁸⁸ Coffey 1989, 189.

⁸⁹ This and the former citation are from Slater 1990, 172.

⁹⁰ Consider, for example, what happens in translation when every single word of the “direct” speech of a character is altered to another language and nevertheless retains its status as the direct speech of that same character.

thine solipsism, which Slater abhors, is more often and less fearfully termed narrative subjectivity.

Tryphaena's speech makes Encolpius' activity in creating the story unusually obtrusive for the reason that he changes his discourse type from prose to hexameter at the very moment he begins to speak as if he were Tryphaena. This makes us associate the prose with his voice and the hexameter with her voice. But then, when we read (or hear) the word, *exclamat*, in the middle of the first line of the meter, we realize that things are not so simple. *Exclamat* is, of course, not spoken in Tryphaena's *persona*, but in the narrator's own voice. We are therefore forced to reject the metrical form of the language as a mark of her voice, and recognize that the narrator has merely switched to narrating in meter instead of his customary prose. But what a place to make that switch! Our reconsideration and final conclusion that Tryphaena cannot have spoken these words as such is based on the observation that the "unit of meter", which in hexameter is the single verse, does not square with the "unit of utterance" attributed to Tryphaena. In order to "restore" her actual speech, we would have to remove the word *exclamat*, and leave a silent hole in the hexameter line.⁹¹

The present case is the only instance of this exact type of jarring in the extant text of the *Satyrica*, but a similar effect occurs indeed in all hexameter verses where the "unit of utterance" does not square with the "unit of meter".⁹² Although in epic the main narrative is conducted in hexameters, such passages of direct speech interrupted in the middle to add the declarative statement (as is common practice in Latin prose) are formal absurdities that disprove themselves as historical utterances, since the declarative statement, when removed, there too leaves a silent hole in the verse. In the *Satyrica* we are, however, made more sensitive to the problem due to the jarring transi-

⁹¹ Or add a metrically equivalent phrase, such as the words that we find instead of *exclamat* in the verse as reported by Isidore (*Etym.* 2.21.19, *quis furor, o cives, pacem convertit in arma*) who fails to mention the poet's name.

⁹² E.g., the "quotation" of Entellus in Virgil's narrative (*Aen.* 5.473–76):

*hic victor, superans animis tauroque superbus,
 "nate dea vosque haec," inquit, "cognoscite, Teucrici,
 et mihi quae fuerint iuvenali in corpore vires,
 et qua servetis revocatum a morte Dareta."
 dixit et ...*

(“At this the victor cries, triumphant in spirit and glorying in the bull:
 ‘You goddess-born,’ *he said*, ‘and you Trojans, learn
 what strength I had in my youthful body,
 and from what impending death you recall and rescue Dares.’
 So he spoke ...”)

tion from prose to poetry at the very beginning of the impersonated speech. For this reason it is clear that the word “exclamat” has not been thoughtlessly inserted here although this seems to be the case in Virgil (*Aen.* 5.473–76). The effect of the anomaly is simply too good—that is if it is noticed and understood for what it is—and exceedingly appropriate to Encolpius’ constant play with different discourse types, for it leads to a sudden realization in the reader/hearer that conventional epic heroes address each other, absurdly, in verses, and that no historical individuals can have spoken thus! As we shall discuss in more detail below, this is very much in keeping with the general tendency in the *Satyrice* to represent poetry comically as a sort of speech aberration.

1.2.2 The Identities of Voices

The ancient theory of discourse within discourse is best considered in the context of delivery and with respect to the capacity of the living voice to alter its identifying features. The paradigm of the human voice is better suited for the problematics of narrative and story telling than is the static and silent formalist vision of the printed page, which knows no other method of distinguishing voices than typographical signs. For marking the change in speaker-identity, the natural modulations of the human voice ideally make unnecessary even the paraphernalia of the theater. As Quintilian explains, voices are no less constitutive of identities than are faces:

ut facies, quanquam ex paucissimis constat, infinitam habet differentiam, ita vox, etsi paucas, quae nominari possint, continent species, propria cuique est, et non haec minus auribus quam oculis illa dinoscitur. (*Inst.* 11.3.18)

As the face, although consisting of very few features, is found in infinite variety, so the voice, although there are only a few kinds to which we can give a name, is proper to each; in fact the voice is no less recognizable by the ear than the face is by the eye.

Ut facies, ita vox is a succinct and appropriate formulation of the simple principle which makes possible narrative impersonation or speech in the voice of another. In practice this is accomplished by using the voice in a particular manner. The *Rhetorica ad Herennium* contains the following ad-

vice to the would-be orator as to how he should deliver the utterances of others concerning the case being expounded:

si qua inciderint in narrationem dicta, rogata, responsa, si quae admirationes de quibus nos narrabimus, diligenter animum advertemus ut omnium personarum sensus atque animos voce exprimamus. (*Rhet. Her.* 3.14.24)

If it so happens that in the narration there occur statements, questions, or answers, or some comments about the case we are relating, we shall give careful attention to express through the voice the feelings and thoughts of all the *personae*.

The semantic logic of identity makes it necessary for the old identity of the voice to be momentarily suppressed for the new one to come out, and so there is no keeping track of the layers of identities, although the actual moment of change is highly significant and allows us to partly retain the memory of the suppressed identity. This underlying identity, however, does not remain functional on the surface level, but is kept in suspension until the speaker is recognized again for what he was before.

1.2.3 The Apotheosis of Encolpius

This brings us to the methodological quandary of the currently popular theatrical interpretation of the *Satyrica*, which I presented earlier as one of several readings enabled by the use of the *Fragmenta* as “comparison text”.⁹³ The essential quality of classical narrative is that it is conducted through one *persona* (the underlying speaker identity which reappears after occasional subordinate impersonations) and thus the whole work falls into a single unbroken context, whereas the dramatic form makes use of many basic *dramatis personae* and therefore many textual *partes*, each of which forms a distinct context within the play (although in performance the action connects them). As before, it is the recognition of the speaker identity which places the utterance within its proper context and thus determines how it should be understood. A written dramatic text is practically unintelligible if the proper

⁹³ Panayotakis 1994a, xx, “The surviving *Satyrica* [...] should be regarded as a sophisticated synthesis of many different literary genres, including oratory, historiography, epic, elegy, satire, Greek romance, and drama [...] the element of theatricality is a dominant feature in the *Satyrica*”.

names of the characters (not pronounced on stage since the speakers are identifiable by their visible masks) are not included in the margin. On the page, therefore, the proper names function as masks do on stage, i.e., as contextual markers. The *Satyrica* can be thought of as theatrical only in so far as we recognize that in staging the work we would need only one actor for the basic voice, or *persona*, of Encolpius. The term “actor”, however, may be misleading, since the *Satyrica* is no drama and lacks all action in performance apart from the gesticulation which would accompany a lively delivery.

It is as if the promoters of the theatrical interpretation of the *Satyrica* wanted to translate Encolpius’ narrative into so many modern-style stage directions (ancient stage directions were carried in the text: not “enter X”, but “here comes X”). As sometimes seems to happen in the writings of modern narratologists, the characters of the story are treated as primary and the narrator is sublimated into a “voice from heaven”.⁹⁴ Costas Panayotakis makes much of “the fact that the *Satyrica* can be read theatrically as if it were the narrative equivalent of a farcical staged piece with the dramatic structure of a play produced before an audience.”⁹⁵ It is quite possible that there is some “theatrical” quality to the work, but there is certainly no “dramatic structure” in the narrative of the *Satyrica*. In order to enhance the theatrical qualities of the *Satyrica* Panayotakis therefore simply rewrites the Quartilla episode and the quarrel of Encolpius and Ascyrtos (79.11-80.6) as dialogue and stage directions. As we intend to show, the *Satyrica* is written to be recited in a lively manner. As such it is performance literature, as are plays. I would like to stress, however, the rather obvious fact that not all performance literature is drama. Indeed, a paradoxical requirement of the current theatrical reading, at least in its most exaggerated form, is to virtually obliterate the only *persona* of the work that could, without rewriting the text, be presented on stage, Encolpius the narrator.

⁹⁴ The interpretation of Scripture as the word of God must necessarily dispense with the rhetorical emphasis on the speaking person, time and circumstances of utterance (e.g. since the *persona* of God is omnipresent and eternal). In the famous sixteenth-century quarrel of Luther and Erasmus over the freedom of the will, the biblical exegete Luther criticizes the more rhetorically minded Erasmus for applying the criteria of time, place and person to the interpretations of Scripture. According to Luther “God did not give us a word which gives a hoot for places, persons and times” (*Nec dedit nobis Deus uerbum, quod locorum, personarum, temporum delectum habeat*—Luther, *De servo arbitrio* [1525], 628 [W]).

⁹⁵ Panayotakis 1994a, 320; the formulation of the phrase “narrative equivalent of a stage farce” belongs to Walsh 1974, 186, Panayotakis’ supervisor at the University of Glasgow. This seems to be the main position of Slater 1990, 14, as well: “[R]eading is far from a passive process. It is just as participatory, though in different ways, as watching a performance in the theatre.”

Certain accidents of preservation have contributed to making apparently viable the dramatic interpretation. It so happens that the extant text of the *Satyrica* opens not in a passage of the narrative, but in the middle of an impersonated speech, in the voice of the character of young Encolpius. Likewise, by accident, the text breaks off in the middle of a speech of another character, the poet Eumolpus. But perhaps even more confusing than the mutilated condition of the beginning and the end of the manuscript tradition is the fact that in several places, where the text is very fragmentary, modern editors have added in the margin the names of characters who are thought to be the speakers of such isolated fragments (in some places the name of the supposed addressee and subject of the speech is also included).⁹⁶ These additions derive originally from the scribes of the Longer Fragments; they are obvious attempts at reconstructing the internal context and of course were not found in the original text. Bücheler left them out of his edition, while later editors such as Ernout and Müller have included them. By virtue of these marginal glosses, parts of the fragmentary modern text have taken on the appearance of a dramatic text.

Another contributing factor is faulty method. By reason of a certain unhappy use of terminology, the protagonist Encolpius is commonly referred to as the “narrator”, although he is, from the point of view of narrative form, not the teller of the story, but a character represented in it.⁹⁷ It is, of course, Encolpius the narrator (who exists in the present of the narrating act) who represents this younger self (existing in the narrated past), sometimes by providing information about him and sometimes by speaking on his behalf. In fact, the narrator’s representation of his younger self is effected by more or less the same technique as is used for his treatment of other characters. Although the narrator is the same individual as the young man Encolpius, both the time and the circumstances of speech are different, and these comprise defining qualities of speaker *personae*.

If the *Satyrica* is not a dramatic text, and not even the “narrative equivalent” (to me an incomprehensible phrase) of such a text, what then can we make of the handful of places where the narrated events of the story are explicitly described as mime-like and theatrical? To begin with we are certainly not required to interpret references of this sort as Encolpius’ attempt to settle the typological problem raised by his narrative in favor of theatrical mime.⁹⁸ If we consider closely the context in which he uses terms such as

⁹⁶ 85.1, 94.1, 96.7, 99.1, 104.1, 107.1, 113.11, 126.1, 128.1, 128.3, 128.7, 129.1, 132.1, 134.1, 134.8.

⁹⁷ On this “fallacy” in modern narratology, see Genette 1988, 223.

⁹⁸ Walsh’s 1974, 189, assumption that “[t]he central action of the *Satyricon* [...] is pointed up

mimicus or *scaena*, we note that it is to underline a certain strange and alien quality of narrated situations and acts. Quartilla's laughter is *mimicus* because it expresses her sinister joy at having the boys absolutely in her power (19.1). Trimalchio's dining room resembles the performance of a mime because, as Encolpius notes with amazement, both the slaves and the host himself are continuously singing *cantica* from literary mimes (31.6, 35.6, 55.5–6). The reason is that the freedman host, because of his lack of aristocratic education, when entertaining guests in his dining room looks for his models in public entertainment such as the mime, and is quite ignorant of the proper etiquette of the Roman *triclinium*.⁹⁹ It is therefore the mime which in the narrator's mind seems misplaced. Furthermore, the friendship of Ascylos and Giton is compared to a farce, because Encolpius sees it as having been deceitful in the light of their later betrayal (80.9). The mock-suicide of Giton is associated with the mime because it is blatant *Scheintod* (94.15, *mimicam mortem*); the slave-disguise on the ship is a mime because it is designed as deception (106.1, *mimicis artibus*); and finally the confidence trick of Eumolpus is given this name for the reason that Eumolpus and company take on roles to deceive for financial gain (117.4). Though certain incidents that supposedly happened to the narrator in his past strike him in hindsight, as he delivers the narrative, as if he had been trapped in a low and tasteless farce, this certainly does not justify the claim that mime is a "source" for the *Satyrica*, or that the work has been "influenced" or shaped by the genre of theatrical farces.¹⁰⁰

Such comparisons may come naturally to Encolpius, because in the first century the mime was by far the most popular form of theater.¹⁰¹ It is questionable whether it was even possible to depict common people without resorting to re-presenting them according to the convention of contemporary farce. Certain similarities, therefore, between the *Satyrica* and the contemporary theater may well be commonplaces of the culture. Theater in general

by so many references to the mime that the novel proclaims itself the narrative equivalent of a stage farce" [my underlining] is superficial.

⁹⁹ It is true that dinner-theater and other entertainments seem to have been frequent in the houses of the wealthy (Plin. *Ep.* 9.17.1; Quint. *Inst.* 1.2.8), but it is also true that moralists (Plut. *Mor.* 711A ff.) wanted such activities to be reserved for public entertainment on the stage, and Encolpius' words show that he sides here with that austere faction (*Sat.* 31.7). The blurring of public and private in dinner theater and theater-dinners is discussed by Jones 1991, 185–98.

¹⁰⁰ Early protesters against Rosenblüth's original 1909 thesis (that theatrical farce was an important "source" for Petronius when he composed the *Satyrica*) include Möring 1915 and Paratore 1933, 1:99–104.

¹⁰¹ For a survey of the documentary evidence for the ancient mime, see Maxwell 1993.

and the mime in particular, of course, provide potent metaphors in the *Satyrica*, and there is no question that the rhetorical and philosophical vocabulary relied heavily on the institutional practices of the theater. However, where mime is explicitly mentioned in the *Satyrica*, this seems to include a rejection of this form as “different” and no less unappealing to our narrator than, let us say, declamation, or verbose epic. As I have argued above, the theatrical reading of the work seems to be influenced by a vision of the text as fragments broken out by genre. To select one of these fragments as “the genre” of the *Satyrica* is unlikely to settle the question.

By concentrating on qualities that he rejects, Encolpius increases their importance as a “generic other” (and therefore as an indirect means to arrive at his “generic self”). It is more fruitful to see such allusions in the *Satyrica* as attempts to negotiate a “difference” and thus to establish the proper qualities of this narrative by positioning it with respect to other somewhat related forms. In this sense the work at hand conforms to the regular practice of ancient literature, since in the Greco-Roman generic system definitions of individual works are more often negative than positive, and arrived at by reference to what the work is not, rather than what it is (not “this is elegy” but “this is not epic or tragedy”). We should resist the tendency to view an ancient genre as an absolute category. If this were the case, the constant renegotiations within the system would not be necessary.¹⁰² In fact, the laws of the genre are often violated in order to be re-established (a cliché of comic narratives runs something like this: “dear reader, know that we are ascending to the tragic buskin”). The difference between drama and narrative, however, is not a question of genre, and therefore does not depend on generic negotiation. This distinction is more basic, and regards the number and interrelations of the masks. Neither does the discourse-type, of which we find a great variety in the *Satyrica*, affect this distinction. Although generic categories are usually open to renegotiation, prosimetry is not properly a genre, in my view, any more than prose or poetry for that matter is a genre.¹⁰³

1.2.4 Remembering is Telling

We now come to the mode of presentation implied by the narrative of Encolpius. At three points the narrator explicitly states that he is recalling from

¹⁰² On the messiness of ancient genres, see Hinds 1998.

¹⁰³ This rule did not, however, seem to apply to the discourse type of hexameter which was pretty much equated with the genre of “epic” in the tradition of ancient rhetorical criticism, see Koster 1970. For the opposite view of prosimetry as a genre, see Relihan 1993.

memory what he is relating. In two of the three cases it is an apparent attempt to remember the exact wording of a written text, which prompts the reference to memory. The first instance occurs in the context of a detailed description of certain tablets in Trimalchio's house, one of which has an inscription which Encolpius attempts to cite *verbatim* with the following reservation: *si bene memini*—"if I remember correctly" (30.3). Again he relates an incident when a cup was passed around with inscribed *pittacia*—"strips of cloth," which were recited while countless presents with punning associations were offered. After recounting eight of these jokes, he says: *sexcenta huiusmodi fuerunt, quae iam exciderunt memoriae meae*—"there were countless [labels] of this kind, but they have now slipped my memory" (56.10). We note that it is implied by these references to memory that enough time has passed from the events related until the narrating instance itself (the word *iam* clearly marks the present of narration with respect to the past of the event) to make accurate recollection problematic. Measuring this time span may be impossible, but this is less important than understanding the basic premise of the *Satyrice's* narrative, viz., that it is presented as Encolpius' recollections of events experienced by him in the past. This is of course the classical constitution of autobiographical narratives, also called "recollections", or *memoirs*, to highlight the role played by memory in this narrative form.¹⁰⁴

That references to the limitations of the narrator's memory should be prompted especially by the attempt to cite written documents *verbatim* implies a certain dichotomy with respect to how written and non-written words are treated when reported. Only the former, when cited, are subject to the verification which the medium of writing enables, whereas the latter are regarded as unverifiable and fleeting, and their citation, therefore, necessarily free of similar constraints. In this respect the *Satyrice* does not differ much from ancient historiographical texts, which represent written documents differently from the occasional speech attributed to a historical personage, which could be freely invented if due respect was paid to what was known about the individual in question and the situation in which the statement was made.¹⁰⁵ It was with good reason that rhetorical theorists consid-

¹⁰⁴ The important role of memory in the ancient formulation of the concept is emphasized in such terms as ὑπομνήματα, ἀπομνημονεύματα, *monumenta*, *commentarius*. Once "memories" have been committed to writing the written text can in turn be viewed as an aid to reminding. Plato calls the art of writing a drug of reminding: "You have discovered a drug not of memory, but of reminding"—οὐ μνήμης ἀλλ' ὑπομνήσεως φάρμακον (*Phaedr.* 275A).

¹⁰⁵ E.g., Sallust limits himself to referring to Cicero's written and published speech against

ered it a useful preparation for historiography to declaim in the persons of historical figures.¹⁰⁶

Now, if we press further this dichotomy of the written and the spoken, we of course notice that the *Satyrica* is itself a written text, although it is not entirely clear whether Encolpius is supposed to be aware of this. There would have been many ways for him to acknowledge as much. A simple mention of the act of writing or reading, understood to apply to his narrative, would have sufficed, or he might have referred explicitly to his recollections as a book. Of the great historians, Thucydides is at pains to clarify that his πόλεμος between the Peloponnesians and Athenians is a written document, κτήμά τε ἐς αἰεὶ μᾶλλον ἢ ἀγώνισμα ἐς τὸ παραχρῆμα ἀκούειν—“and a property for the future rather than a contest for the occasional listener” (2.22.4). Herodotus, however, does not present his ἱστορίας ἀπόδεξις as written any more than spoken. Of the ancient novelists Chariton begins by defining himself as the scribe, ὑπογραφεύς, of the rhetor Athenagoros, and in book 8 predicts that the ending of his written composition, τοῦτο σύγγραμμα (8.1.4), will be the most pleasant to his readers, τοῖς ἀναγιγνώσκουσιν; Xenophon of Ephesus adds at the end that a written version of his tale of Anthia and Habrocomes was dedicated in the famous temple of Artemis in Ephesus (5.15.2); Achilles Tatius is silent about whether his love story, told in the *persona* of Clitophon, is to be thought of as a written document or merely as “spoken”; Longus is definitely engaged in the act of γράφειν (*praef.* 4); Heliodorus’ definition of his story at the end as σύνταγμα makes it into a book; and Apuleius’ Latin version of the Ass-Story is a *papyrus* to be read (1.1), and its narrator is destined to become several “books” (2.12).

Unfortunately, we do not have the whole text of the *Satyrica* and so the possibility cannot be excluded entirely that such a reference did in fact occur, for example, at the beginning. However, as far as it goes, our text of the *Satyrica* does not present its narrator as betraying any knowledge of the fact that his words constitute a written text. Tentatively, then, we can say that Encolpius’ narrative is not just presented as a recollection from memory, but also seeks to hide its own textuality, leaving the impression of a living voice telling the story.

The idea of the “orality” of Encolpius’ narrative is strengthened by his third reference to memory, prompted by the recollection of certain items of food, *quarum etiam recordatio me, si qua est dicenti fides, offendit*—“the mere recollection of which, take this speaker’s word for it, disgusts me”

Catilina (*orationem ... quam postea scriptam edidit*) without even relating its contents (*Cat.* 31.6), but freely recreates unpublished speeches.

¹⁰⁶ Quint. *Inst.* 3.8.49.

(65.1). What is being alluded to here is not something Encolpius claims he said or heard in the past of the story; this is Encolpius presenting himself in the act of “speaking” the *Satyrica*. Later in the story he again refers to his act of speaking the text when trying to describe the beauty of Circe, *quidquid dixero minus erit*—“whatever I say will fall short” (126.14). These phrases go beyond a passive omission of a reference to the fact that the narrative exists in the form of a written document; they actively attempt to create the impression that the narrator is “speaking” his story as the memories flood his mind. Significantly, the formula *si qua est fides* (literally: “if by any chance there is faith [in the speaker]”) occurs predominantly in the emphatic pleading of declamatory speeches, a genre of literature that must be classified as performative and “spoken”.¹⁰⁷ Encolpius’ particular use of the declamatory formula even includes for emphasis the rare additional feature of the present participle, *dicens*, referring to himself. There is no weightier testimony as to the manner in which he tells his story.

By the most natural reasoning, “remembering” equals “telling”, as is made plain in the phrase *vivorum meminimus*, “let’s remember/talk about the living”, which occurs twice in the extant *Satyrica* (43.1, 75.7). The memory of past events necessarily triggers emotional responses in the present as the story is told.¹⁰⁸ The recollecting done by Encolpius is not just an activity of the intellect, but involves a vivid taste memory experienced as

¹⁰⁷ Sen. *Con.* 1.1.18, 7.1.7, 7.5.1, 7.6.9, 9.4.5, 9.6.19; *excerpta* 5.1.1, 7.5.1, 8.3.1; [Quint.] *Decl.* 1.5, 3.3, 4.2, 9.10, 12.8, 16.4 (*si qua dicentis fides est*). Apul. *Apol.* 43. Virgil and Ovid use the formula (sometimes modifying it) especially in the character speeches of epic (*A.* 2.142, 3.433; *Met.* 9.55, 371, 15.361) and in elegy when the poet pleads with his *puella* (e.g. *Am.* 1.3.16); such rhetorical formulae in Ovid’s language are usually explained as influence from declamation.

¹⁰⁸ 10.4, *rurusus in memoriam revocatus iniuriae* (“I was again reminded of his insult”); 54.3, *pessime mihi erat, ne his precibus periculum aliquid catastropha quaeritur. nec enim adhuc exciderat cocus ille qui oblitus fuerat porcum exinterare* (“I was very much afraid that this petition was leading up to some comic trick. The cook who had forgotten to gut the pig had not yet faded from my recollection”); 81.2, *redeunte in animum solitudine atque contemptu* (“as my solitude and rejection again came to mind”); 113.3, *non Lichas risit, sed iratum commovens caput ... non dubie redierat in animum Hedyle expilatamque libidiosa migratione navigium* (“Lichas didn’t laugh but shook his head angrily ... no doubt it was Hedyle who came to mind and how his ship had been pillaged on her libidinous elopement”); 106.2, *Lichas memor adhuc uxoris corruptae iniuriarumque, quas in Herculis porticu acceperat, turbato vehementius vultu proclamat* (“Lichas, still remembering the seduction of his wife and the insults he took in the Portico of Hercules, cried out with an even more violent look on his face”); 131.10, *ut me vidit paululum erubuit, hesternae sicut iniuriae memor* (“So when she saw me, she blushed a little, no doubt remembering yesterday’s insult”).

nausea in the present. The strong disgust of the previous passage is further underscored in phrases such as *pudet referre quae secuntur*—“One is ashamed to tell what follows” (70.8), where the present tense of the verb, *secuntur* (frequent alternative spelling of *sequuntur*, see *OLD* s.v.), shows that what follows is the narrative of the subsequent events of the story, not just the events themselves. It is interesting to note that the English translators Heseltine 1913, Sullivan 1986, and Walsh 1997 all change the tense of *quae secuntur* and translate “what happened” or “followed”. But it is the telling in the present that is shameful. As the demand for literal accuracy prompted the first two references to memory, the necessity to induce belief in the outrageous and incredible elicits an appeal to trust, which ultimately depends on the authority and character of the speaker. At a subordinate level, Encolpius also impersonates Ascylos as uttering the above mentioned declamatory formula of appeal, while questioning his own and Encolpius’ credibility in the *urbs Graeca* where they have but newly arrived and are strangers to the locals: “Who in this place knows us, or who will take our words for anything” (14.1, ‘*quis ... hoc loco nos novit, aut quis habebit dicentibus fidem?*’). He also uses the same figure, when impersonating Trimalchio as he tries to induce belief in the superstitious werewolf-story of Niceros: “I most certainly believe you, take my word for it that my hair stood on end. I know for a fact that Niceros doesn’t tell trifling stories” (63.1, ‘*salvo ... tuo sermone ... si qua fides est, ut mihi pili inhorruerunt, quia scio Niceronem nihil nugarum narrare*’).

Once more he uses the figure, now again at the primary level, when he relates his own reaction that night after Ascylos had abducted Giton from his bed while he was fast asleep in drunken slumber:

itaque ego ut experrectus pertrectaui gaudio despoliatum torum, si qua est amantibus fides, ego dubitavi, an utrumque traicerem gladio somnumque morti iungerem. tutius dein secutus consilium Gitona quidem verberibus excitavi, Ascylos autem truci intuens vultu. (*Sat.* 79.10)

So as I woke up and ran my hands over the bed robbed of its joy, take my word for it, that’s how we lovers are, I wondered whether to run the pair of them through with my sword and prolong their sleep in death. But following a safer plan, I woke Giton with blows and glared at Ascylos with a savage look on my face.

The idea of killing Giton, his love, and Ascylos, his friend and former lover, is offered by Encolpius as a measure of his intense suffering. At the same

time this outrageous event of his story is accounted for by reminding whoever is listening that this is a tale told by a lover, one of many such tales (hence the plural in *amantibus*), and therefore normal and credible of its kind. It is not just that Encolpius was a lover in the narrated past when he supposedly experienced this unhappy incident, he still presents himself as a lover to his audience as he relates the story of that incident, for he uses the present tense: *si qua est amantibus fides*.

The main narrative of the *Satyrical* is free of any immediate context (the title and name of the author in themselves do not provide a context) and so it is not introduced by an external speaker who then impersonates the narrator. This is the case, on the other hand, with Clitophon's erotic recollections in the work of Achilles Tatius. Here we get a full description of the young man before he starts telling his story. In the *Satyrical*, however, only the subordinate speeches are introduced by Encolpius before he undertakes the change in speaker identity. Lacking an ulterior narrator who tells us how Encolpius tells his story, we must try to figure this out from the story itself. This is not as complicated as it might seem at first and there is, indeed, a simple method for catching him in the act, as it were. If we carefully observe how he describes the manner of speech of the subordinate personae, before and after he impersonates them, we may capture at least the style of these parts of his narrative. By working our way from there, we can get an adequate picture of his over-all manner of telling the story.

As it turns out, Encolpius regularly brings the subordinate personae into his impersonation clapping their hands (11.2, 18.7–19.3, 24.2, 34.7, 137.1),¹⁰⁹ shouting (9.7–8, 30.5, 64.12, 97.1, 106.2), laughing or smiling (11.2, 18.7–19.3, 57.1, 64.12, 65.5, 69.2, 78.2, 126.8–9), crying (81.2), with some expression on their faces (30.10, 48.1, 49.8, 53.8, 79.11, 90.5, 91.2, 105.1, 106.3, 115.4, 128.2), and gesticulating in various ways (7.2, 8.1, 11.3, 13.2, 17.3, 18.4, 24.7, 33.1, 39.2, 47.1, 49.7, 64.8, 67.5, 69.5, 74.2, 78.3, 78.5, 80.1, 91.8, 92.3, 99.5, 101.1, 101.2, 105.9, 113.2, 114.5, 114.8, 114.10, 115.12, 127.1, 131.10, 132.13, 134.10, 139.4), or otherwise indicating their mood before they begin to speak (8.2, 9.7, 24.1, 52.8, 71.1, 98.2, 100.4, 100.6, 104.2, 106.1, 131.7). Finally, there are descriptions of the tone of voice in which statements are uttered, of the type: *ingerebat nihilo minus Trimalchio lentissima voce*—“nevertheless Trimalchio kept repeating in the most drawn-out voice possible.”¹¹⁰ On the whole, in fact, the *Satyrical* gives

¹⁰⁹ Quartilla also wrings her hands till the joints crack (17.3).

¹¹⁰ 36.7. See also 126.8, *vox clara* 47.11; *vox canora* 68.4; *rabiosa barbaraque voce* 96.5; *vox eiusmodi congemuit* 100.3.

the impression of being an extremely “clamorous” text, judging from its uniquely rich vocabulary in this department.¹¹¹

Based on this internal evidence it is clear that Encolpius’ style of speaking is not at all restrained. Every time he gives a description of the expression on the face of a persona, or some simple gesture like clapping the hands, or the tone of voice in which he or she utters the phrases, that description also becomes descriptive of how his own impersonation is conducted, and is thus an important direction as to how the narrative itself should be delivered in performance. When the reciter or performer comes upon a phrase of the type, “and he shouted”, followed by a character statement, the most natural manner of delivering that statement is by mimicking a shouting tone of voice. The same is true of gesticulation. These built-in stage directions, in fact, are similar to those used in ancient drama in general, where characters are regularly made to describe the manner of imminent action on stage in their actual dialogues, as opposed to such directions being external to the text and added in the margin in the manner of modern theatrical texts.¹¹²

Another quality of the *Satyrice*, which is owed to its presentational mode, is the curiously disruptive style of its narrative discourse. Although perhaps in danger of being confused with it, this characteristic of the work is very different from textual fragmentation. By virtue of the form, Encolpius the narrator has only one voice and can impersonate no more than one speaker at a time. But it is as if the many invoked identities of the *Satyrice* were competing to possess his faculty of speech. In the opening passages of the extant text, Agamemnon interrupts Encolpius declaiming in the portico, just as the rhetor in a lost passage was interrupted “sweating out” a *suasoria*

¹¹¹ *clamare* 1.1, 9.7, 14.5, 40.1, 46.8, 52.6, 58.5, 60.8, 68.3, 95.5, 107.10, 108.5, 108.7, 115.3, 127.9 v. 6, 137.4, 138.3; *clamitare* 92.7; *conclamare* 50.1, 54.1, 102.9; *declamare* 3.1, 48.4, 137.9 v. 5; *exclamare* 21.1, 22.4, 30.5, 49.5, 74.7 and 11, 83.4, 94.13, 95.3, 103.1, 105.5, 108.14, 135.2; *proclamare* 9.5, 14.6, 43.1, 54.2, 64.12, 67.13, 68.4, 80.4, 81.2, 97.1, 104.5, 105.7, 106.2, 115.9; *clamor* 14.7, 40.2, 59.6, 68.5, 73.4, 89.1 v. 20, 92.7, 94.9, 108.8, 109.1, 114.8, 136.13; *declamatio* 2.3, 6.1, 48.4, 107.12, 133.1; *declamator* 1.1; *vocare* 24.6, 36.8, 47.11, 49.4, 67.3, 69.5, 117.10, 132.2, 133.1; *vox* 24.4, 34.1, 35.6, 36.7, 41.6, 44.9, 47.11, 59.3, 68.4, 70.7, 74.1, 91.5, 92.7, 96.5, 100.3, 100.5, 105.6, 105.7, 105.9, 108.4, 108.5, 113.8, 118.4, 120 v. 78, 121 v. 102, 122 v. 155, 122 v. 180, 124 v. 183, 127.1, 127.5, 134.6, 140.9; *vociferatio* 14.5; *vociferare* 114.6; *strepitus* 1.2; *sonare* 5 v. 18; *exsonare* 73.4, 109.6; *personare* 122 v. 177; *sonus* 2.2, 5 v. 16, 41.7, 68.5, 100.5, 105.6, 115.2, 127.5; *sonitus* 123 v. 225; *canor* 5 v. 19; *cantare* 28.5, 31.4, 31.5, 34.1, 53.13, 62.4, 64.3, 70.7; *canturire* 64.2; *cantus* 109.6, 120 v. 72, 131.8 v. 8; *canticum* 31.6, 35.6, 73.3; *exsibilare* 64.5.

¹¹² E.g., Davos’ words in Terence’s *Phormio*: “Ah, is that Geta (coming there)? ... All right: here he is” (Ter. *Ph.* 50f., *DAVOS: sed videon Getam? ... praestost.*), as opposed to the modern interlinear, “ENTER *Geta* FROM *Demiphos*’s HOUSE”, which has been added in the Loeb English translation.

in the school (3.1; 6.1); and the rhetorician is again interrupted by the *ingens scholasticorum turba*—"the enormous mob of scholastics" as he extemporizes a type of Lucilian satire in the portico (6.1–2). Frequently, in order to speak, a *persona* must interrupt another's speech, who accordingly is not allowed to finish. Trimalchio interrupts Hermeros (39.1); Seleucus Dama (42.1); Phileros Seleucus (43.1); Echion Ganymedes—in the middle of a sentence—(45.1); Trimalchio his accountant (53.6–8); a slave reciting the *pittacia* interrupts his master (56.7); Scintilla Habinnas (69.1); Encolpius Eumolpus (93.3); Encolpius, Eumolpus and Giton each other (102.1–103.1); Hesus Lichas (104.5); Lichas Eumolpus (107.7); Eumolpus Lichas (107.12); and finally Chrysis interrupts Encolpius (139.4). Occasionally, the events related in the narrative either make possible some character's speech (14.8), or more often the narrated action cuts short someone who is speaking.¹¹³ Young Encolpius is at times left speechless from shame after a verbal onslaught from another character.¹¹⁴ Certain utterances also interrupt the events of the story.¹¹⁵ It also happens that events are supposed to take place in the background while a character is speaking.¹¹⁶ And there are other speech-related interruptions.¹¹⁷ All these have to do not just with how things supposedly happened in the past, but rather how Encolpius gives narrative form to his memories.

The way in which he organizes his narrative can also have significance for the over-all impact he wishes to create. At the dinner party of Trimalchio, the host tyrannizes the faculty of speech and must, quite literally, be narrated to the pot in order to enable the famous speeches of the freedmen to take place (41.9). Upon returning, he again becomes the dominant *persona* (47.1). A most interesting paradox in the narrative of the dinner-party is the silence imposed upon the *scholastici*, who are formally trained speakers (46.1, 58.8), while untrained speakers are allowed to ramble on freely (61.3–5). What causes the silence of the scholastics is not that they appreciate the discourse of the freedmen, but the fact that they are Trimalchio's parasites and have only been invited to dinner to flatter him and allow him to pose as one who appreciates the liberal arts and associates with educated men.¹¹⁸ When, fi-

¹¹³ 52.4; 49.1, 54.1, 74.1, 90.1, 93.4, 99.5, 114.6, 110.1.

¹¹⁴ E.g. 10.3, from Ascylos; 108.1, from Lichas.

¹¹⁵ 26.8, 53.1, 97.1, 100.3–5, 106.1, 105.7.

¹¹⁶ 7.5, 34.7, 41.6, 97.1, 124.2.

¹¹⁷ 115.4, 108.3.

¹¹⁸ 48.7, *haec aliaque cum effussissimis prosequeremur laudationibus* ("We followed this and other attempts of his with the most profuse shouts of admiration"); and 52.7, *excepimus urbanitatem iocantis [sc. Trimalchionis], at ante omnes Agamemnon qui sciebat quibus meritis revocaretur ad cenam* ("We praised the urbanity of Trimalchio's joke, but none more

nally, the long suppressed laughter of Ascyrtos and Giton breaks out, it is met with the aggressive and solecistic “eloquence” of Hermeros (57.1–58.14).¹¹⁹ Ascyrtos’ attempt to respond is quickly cut short by the delighted host himself (59.1). Even when invited to relate the day’s declamation, Agamemnon is interrupted by the freedman’s need to drop an “urbane” remark (48.5). Throughout this part of the narrative we note the heavy irony of the narrator,¹²⁰ and the freedmen’s unappreciative attitude towards higher learning,¹²¹ which seeks to substitute liberal letters with *litterae in domusionem*—“letters for domestic uses” (46.7, 48.4), which is the only form of literacy they appreciate.¹²²

1.2.5 Scripted Memories

From the immediacy of the *Satyrica*’s presentation stems another unique feature of the work, namely the deliberate attempt of the narrator to treat all literature as oral literature, or as plain speech, not just his own narrative, but declamatory speeches, poetry of various types, as well as the self-contained subordinate narratives. True, the *Satyrica* as a whole is a narrative and so even the wall paintings in Trimalchio’s house (29) can only be seen through the verbal commentary they provoke. However, the mode of presentation goes further here than is necessary in a written document since, as a rule, what is explicitly said to be written literature is not quoted directly from the written document (and displayed in writing on a page of the *Satyrica*), but only enters the narrative or is alluded to indirectly, when someone actually

than Agamemnon who knew how to earn another dinner invitation”).

¹¹⁹ Cf. 32.1, *Trimalchio ... expressit imprudentibus risum* (“the sight of Trimalchio ... provoked laughter from those of us who were imprudent”).

¹²⁰ E.g., 39.1, *tam dulces fabulas* (“such sweet tales”) of the vulgar gossip of Hermeros; 59.1, *eloquentia* (“eloquence”) about the same freedman’s barbarous speech; 60.1, *tam elegantes strophas* (“such sophisticated turns”) about the histrionics of a meat carver; 61.5, *haec ubi dicta dedit, talem fabulam exorsus est* (“These were the words he uttered; then he embarked upon this tale”), the former phrase being an epic cliché (cf. Verg. A. 2.790 and Austin 1980, *ad loc.*) here used to introduce Nicerus’ badly told werewolf-story; 70.7, *ingeniosus cocus* (“genius cook”); 74.5, *doctissimo coco* (“most learned cook”).

¹²¹ 71.12, *“nec umquam philosophum audivit”* (“He never heard a philosopher lecture”).

¹²² 46.8, *“litterae thesaurum est”* (“letters are a treasure”), which refers not to liberal letters but to the practical use of writing; cf. 46.7, *“emi ergo nunc puero aliquot libra rubricata, quia volo illum ad domusionem aliquid de iure gustare. habet haec res panem. nam litteris satis inquinatus est”* (“I bought the boy some books with red letters in them a little time ago. I want him to have a taste of law in order to manage the property. Law has bread in it. He’s tainted enough as it is with literature”).

reads it aloud or recites from memory. To make this distinction is vital to our reading, since we wish to argue that although a physical text, the *Satyrica* pretends to be a “spoken” discourse, which cannot resort to “displaying” its contents visually as a written text, but must restrict itself to “proclaiming” audibly whatever it has to say. This performance aspect of Encolpius’ narrative is then worked into the description of his past, where all speech (later to be reported by him in the narrative) tends to come to his attention as sonorous utterances in the manner of his own delivery, and not as texts read by him and then reproduced. For the modern “reader” of the *Satyrica*, the effect created is strictly speaking an illusion—the work is just as much a written text as any other—but it is an illusion worth noting for the information it gives about the design of this narrative.

Instances of straightforward reading include the recital of the estate-diary (53.1–9); poetry that is read aloud just after being composed on wax tablets (55.3); written jokes or riddles which are read aloud (56.8); a Latin translation of Homer which is recited in a sing-song manner (59.3); a testament which is read aloud (71.4); and verses mumbled by the poet as he is composing and writing them down (115.1–2), which are finally recited to the captive audience of the poet’s traveling companions, either from memory or through the reading of the parchment on which they were written (118.1–124.2). This last composition, of course, is the *Bellum Civile*, which is by far the longest piece of formal verse in the extant text.

Besides these regular readings there are several instances involving the recital of literature from memory. This can be seen as related to the process of reading because it requires the prior internalization of a written document in memory, and was conceptualized in antiquity as the ability to read without the physical text. Such is the manner in which the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* discusses the techniques of memorization:

Quemadmodum igitur qui litteras sciunt possunt id quod dictatur eis scribere, et recitare quod scripserunt, item qui mnemonica didicerunt possunt quod audierunt in locis conlocare et ex his memoriter pronuntiare. nam loci cerae aut chartae simillimi sunt, imagines litteris, dispositio et conlocatio imaginum scripturae, pronuntiatio lectioni. (*Rhet. Her.* 3.17)

Those who know their letters can thereby write out what is dictated to them and read aloud what they have written. Likewise, those who have learned the techniques of memorization can put what they have heard in “places”, and from those places deliver it by memory. For the places are

very similar to wax tablets or papyrus, the images like letters, the arrangement and placing of the images like writing, and the delivery is like reading.

Even natural and untrained memory is regularly compared to wax writing tablets in the ancient philosophical and rhetorical contexts.¹²³ It is of slight importance to us whether this analogy is valid as a clinical description of the workings of the human memory; it suffices that we accept that the accurate recital of written texts from memory required the texts to be internalized by some means or other. In the *Satyrice*, the Latin verb *recitare* is quite ambiguous about the presence or absence of the physical text, and in fact it does not make the distinctions that seem vital to us, between “reading aloud”, “reciting from memory” or “extemporizing”.¹²⁴

In the category of “reciting from memory” we find the professional *Homeristae* conversing in the original Greek of the poet (59.3); the singing of verses from the *Aeneid* at a dinner party (68.4); the singing of poetry at work or as entertainment (23.3, 34.1, 64.2–5, 70.7); the singing of verses from literary mimes (31.6, 35.6, 53.13, 55.6, 73.3); singing while traveling (28.5, 62.4); and even the recitation of poetry in the baths (73.3, 91.3, 92.6), and in the theater (90.5). The above seem to be instances of recitation from memory, although it is, understandably, difficult to determine in every case whether we are dealing with recitation from memory or extempore recitation.

The third class is that of pure improvisation or extemporization of speeches, poetry and stories. Despite appearances, this activity is also closer to reading than it is to the living voice. To the trained ancient speaker who had perfectly mastered the techniques of memorization, the idea of reading from memory was so familiar, that even improvised formal speaking was thought of as the reading of what one was about to say.¹²⁵ The voice of the extemporizer is variously restrained by written and memorized schemata, sententiae and exempla, and as such it is properly a scripted voice. Consider the astonishing capacity of the Elder Seneca—at least if we believe the rhetor’s own perhaps boastful claims in the introductory words of his (re)collection of *controversiae* and *suasoriae*—to recall innumerable *sententiae* and many whole declamations. Such memory of textual bits and pieces no doubt formed a crucial part of rhetorical training, without which speakers

¹²³ Pl. *Thet.* 191c–d; Arist. *Mem.* 450a–b; Cic. *Part.* 6.26, *de Orat.* 2.88.360.

¹²⁴ Cf. 53.1, 53.9, 55.2, 56.8, 71.4, 91.3, 90.1, 92.6, 90.5.

¹²⁵ Cic. *Orat.* 150, *ut in legendo oculus sic animus in dicendo prospiciet quod sequatur* (“as the eye in reading, so the mind in speaking looks ahead to what comes next”).

and poets were unable to extemporize declamations or verses. According to Quintilian, speaking extempore is the “greatest outcome” (*maximus fructus*) and “most abundant reward” (*praemium amplissimum*) of the long labor of literary studies (*Inst.* 10. 7. 1).

In the *Satyrical* the importance of building a vast literary memory before attempting a formal composition is stressed both by the persona of the rhetorician Agamemnon and by that of the poet Eumolpus, who also happen to be well versed in each other’s art.¹²⁶ In telling his story Encolpius alludes to or represents completely several extemporal pieces: young Encolpius’ declamation in the school portico (1.1–2.9); Agamemnon’s declamation and subsequent extemporization of a poem (3.1–5 v. 22); the *extemporalis declamatio* of the speaker who takes over from Agamemnon (6.1); Eumolpus’ dissertation on the liberal arts and the subsequent extemporization of a poem on the capture of Troy (88.2–90.1); a shorter poem by Eumolpus (93.2); and more declamations (101.7–103.2, 107.1–12, 132.8–133.1, 137.9 v. 5), both *controversiae* (15.3, 48.4–6, 118.2) and *suasoriae* (6.1). The persona of Eumolpus also delivers two short erotic narratives (85.1–87.10; 111.1–112.8), which are simply presented as his own recollections although they are clearly satirical fictions of a certain generic texture. In contrast, we get in Niceros’ werewolf story (61.6–62.14), and in Trimalchio’s ghost story (63.3–10), as well as in his poetry (34.10; 55.3), some faulty examples of literary composition by men who have not had the prerequisite training and exposure to good literature.

Lastly there is a class of “poetry” which is not marked as poetry at all but appears as pure speech, which on occasions makes the transition from prose to poetry and back again within the same syntactical unit (108.13f., 132.11). Quite often the narrator (both while narrating in his own person and during impersonation) switches from one discourse type to another without a warn-

¹²⁶ 4.3, “*ut studiosi iuveni lectione severa irrigarentur ... ut quod vellent imitari diu audirent ... iam illa grandis oratio haberet maiestatis suae pondus*” (“so that bookish boys were steeped in serious reading ... would over a long period listen to pieces they wished to imitate ... then that grand style would gain its full force and splendor”); 5 vv. 1–22, “*artis severae siquid ambit effectus / ... / ... det primos versibus annos / Maeoniumque bibat felici pectore fontem. / ... / ... sic flumine largo / plenus Pierio defundes pectore verba*” (“If any man seeks for success in the stern art / ... / ... let him give his first years to verses / and let his fortunate heart drink of the Homeric fountain / ... / ... so shall one pour out words in swelling torrent from a heart the Muses love”); 118.3–6, “*neque concipere aut edere partum mens potest nisi ingenti flumine litterarum inundata ... nisi plenus litteris sub onere labetur*” (“the mind cannot conceive or bring forth its offspring unless it is steeped in the vast flood of literature ... the poet will sink under the burden unless he is full of literature”).

ing and as if nothing had happened (14.2, 15.9, 18.6, 79.8, 80.9, 82.5, 83.10, 93.2, 112.2, 126.18, 127.9, 128.6, 131.8, 132.8, 132.15, 133.3, 134.12135.8, 136.6, 137.9, 139.2). Most of this metrical speech seems to be new composition, but twice the poetry is actually Virgilian pastiche (112.2, 132.11). This accounts for all the verse in the extant *Satyrica*.

1.2.6 Human Language and *Kunstsprache*

What is the point of the eccentric presentation of the poetry of the *Satyrica*? Some glimpses of the theory behind it are preserved in the often frustratingly limited fragments of the work. The exposition of this theory comes as a part of the introduction of Eumolpus, the compulsive poetaster.¹²⁷ After the poet has been pelted out of the pinacotheca for his recitation, young Encolpius is made to ask him, *Quid tibi vis cum isto morbo?*—“what do you think you are up to with this disease?” (90.3). He then proceeds to remark with amazement that *minus quam duabus horis tecum moraris, et saepius poetice quam humane locutus es*—“during the less than two hours that you have been in my company you have more often spoken like a poet than like a man” (90.3). The distinction here drawn is an essential one for the *Satyrica*: just as declaimers are possessed by some alien madness (1.1, *num alio genere furiarum declamatores inquietantur* [“are declaimers driven mad by a new kind of Furies?”]), poets are crazy. The mark by which we recognize their madness is the way they speak. They do not speak *humane*, but fall into various defective and contrived speech mannerisms which make them seem possessed by alien furies, or to have taken leave of their senses (90.4, *ego quoque sinum meum saxis onerabo, ut quotiescumque coeperis a te exire, sanguinem tibi a capite mittam* [“I too shall load my pockets with stones, and whenever you begin to go out of yourself I shall let blood from you head”]). Formal discourse is contrasted with “human”, i.e., spoken language. The underlying conceit is to recognize no speech as sane other than conversational language and to measure all discourse types by that standard. Everything which deviates from the norm of urbane colloquialism is found to be alienating, insane, or plain ridiculous. The familiarity and spontaneity of

¹²⁷ It might be said that I am here invoking a “comparison text” by selecting a passage of the work to serve as a master-key to the interpretation of the larger context. This is true to some extent and probably unavoidable in any interpretation. However, my reading does not require any transference of context because Encolpius’ qualification of Eumolpus’ poetry as “mad” is already made in the context of (some of) the poetry in the *Satyrica*.

conversational language is such that it seems uniquely “transparent” and normal and therein lies its unassuming but persuasive authority.

To view poetry as inferior to plain talk is of course a reversal of the classical order of discourses. That order, in fact, is briefly promoted by the crazy poet who makes the point that poetry requires that one flee the “vile” and “plebeian” common language (118.4, *refugiendum est ab omni verborum, ut ita dicam, vilitate et sumendae voces a plebe semotae*). But the mad poet’s ideas are immediately undercut by his own admission that poetry is, indeed, madness (118.6, *furantis animi vaticinatio*). The over-all difference in the reception afforded poetry and prose in the *Satyrica* is also striking, and shows how Encolpius himself does not sustain the classical order. While Eumolpus the poet is spontaneously stoned by bystanders for the recitation of his poetry, Eumolpus the teller of short erotic narratives, which are conducted in the same idiom as the main narrative, gets favorable reception from the other characters of the story.¹²⁸

It is important to differentiate here between young Encolpius and the older narrator,¹²⁹ who privileges a loose conversational language, and represents himself in the past as being prone both to rhetorical pomposity and lapses into poetic “madness”. The narrator is considerably more sober, in this particular sense, and although he does occasionally lose his composure and “slip into verse” (mostly in connection with such turbulent topics as Giton or money), he usually corrects himself immediately in balanced conversational prose (e.g., 79.8–9, *sine causa gratulor mihi* [“I congratulate myself without a reason”]), and so is able to continue the narration in a calmer tone. The occasions when the narrator speaks metrically in his own voice are relatively few, but nevertheless significant. In such “lapses” and subsequent “corrections” the boundaries of genres are deliberately crossed for a variety of reasons, but only in order to be re-confirmed afterwards when the narrator’s voice re-settles into conversational rhythm and diction.¹³⁰ Although the purpose of the verse is often to “correct” the characters with a comment, such as a Cynic observation about life (e.g., “money can buy anything”), the apparent “insanity” and lack of seriousness of the verse inevitably subverts the message that the narrator (and his characters) are attempting to deliver.¹³¹ This is a useful technique for many reasons, not the

¹²⁸ See Beck 1979 for a comparison of Eumolpus as poet and story teller.

¹²⁹ The difference between narrator and protagonist will be dealt with in greater detail in section 3.1.

¹³⁰ Beck 1973 alternatively proposed that the “slips into verse” by the narrator represented reconstructions of the protagonist’s fantasies.

¹³¹ Relihan 1993 correctly emphasizes the self-subverting quality of prosimetry without, in my

least because it can be used by the narrator to articulate criticisms indirectly which he otherwise has no moral authority to back.

The basic theory of the mixed discourse seems to date at least to the third century B.C.E. and as far as we can tell was invented by Cynic popular philosophers. Though their own words are mostly lost, the type of philosophical discourse they practiced, and thus the logic of their art, is still preserved.¹³² There exists, for instance, a satiric dialogue by Lucian called *Menippus*. It takes the form of a conversation between the Cynic wise man and an unnamed friend who acts the straight man to the clownish philosopher newly arrived from a trip to the underworld. Menippus begins by addressing his friend with two verses, a pastiche from a play by Euripides. The friend answers with a greeting and a question. Menippus again quotes two lines from another play of Euripides. This goes on until Menippus has uttered nothing but pastiches from Euripides four times in a row and the friend gets irritated, though he is slightly bewildered as to what he should call the type of language that he wishes the philosopher to use, *παῦσαι, μακάριε, τραγῳδῶν καὶ λέγε οὕτωςί πως ἀπλῶς καταβάς ἀπὸ τῶν ἰαμβείων*—“Stop this tragic recital! my dear man, and speak to me this way, somehow, plainly, stepping off the iambs!” Menippus steps off the iambs and answers in Homeric hexameters (!), quoting two lines from the *Odyssey*, except that he replaces the word “mother” in Homer with “friend” to suit his addressee. In exasperation the friend retorts, *οὗτος ἄλλ’ ἢ παραπαίεις· οὐ γὰρ ἂν οὕτως ἐμμέτρως ἔρραψώδεις πρὸς ἄνδρας φίλους*—“Man, you are surely out of your mind, or you wouldn’t rhapsodize metrically in this way to your friends.” Menippus answers (now in conversational language), *μὴ θαυμάσης, ὦ ἑταῖρε· νεωστὶ γὰρ Εὐριπίδην καὶ Ὀμήρω συγγενόμενος οὐκ οἶδ’ ὅπως ἀνεπλήσθην τῶν ἐπῶν καὶ αὐτόματά μοι τὰ μέτρα ἐπὶ τὸ στόμα ἔρχεται*—“Don’t be surprised, my friend, having just been together with Euripides and Homer [in the underworld] somehow—I don’t know how—I’ve become full of words/phrases and spontaneous verses come to my lips.”

We notice that, just as in the *Satyrical*, poetic speech is here treated humorously as a compulsive linguistic affliction; in the case of Menippus it

view, adequately explaining the logic of the interplay between discourse types, and how this logic undercuts opinions and ideas that are being expressed.

¹³² There exists no group of Cynic texts comparable with the Stoic and Epicurean collections. Editions of the fragments are rare and hard to come by and as a result “Cynicism” is often described on the basis of Musonius Rufus, Epictetus, and Dio Chrysostom, whose views are to a large extent Stoic. Lucian is a good source at least with respect to the nature of Cynic literature. The material in Diogenes Laertius is mostly anecdotal, and Julian’s writings on the topic are late and biased. The Cynic epistles are an important but neglected source of information.

is caused by too much time spent with famous dead poets, which is clever metonymy for excessive exposure to the Classics. Both Eumolpus and Menippus, who essentially belong to the same type, lose control and begin to speak in meter automatically, but return to humanity and sanity only when they speak again like ordinarily people. Switching from poetry to conversational prose restores normality. Another important similarity is the idea of being “full of words/phrases” and meters which must break out in ever new recitals. Agamemnon, Eumolpus, and young Encolpius use the same metaphor to describe the desired effects of literary studies, and the state of literary inspiration (5. v. 13–22, 118.6, 126.8).¹³³ It is as if the speaker had first become saturated or *satur* (food-metaphors come easily to the lips of these characters)¹³⁴ with literature and had subsequently gone out of himself or lost his identity and normal manner of speech to become possessed by poetic *personae* from a gallery of classical authors.

Of course, this effect upon the schoolman’s psyche is even more worrisome if the literature one is being exposed to is of inferior quality. In his declamation for Agamemnon, young Encolpius first laments the unreal subject matter and bombastic style of declamation, which he calls *mellitosa verborum globulos et omnia dicta factaque quasi papavere et sesamo sparsa*—“honey-balls of phrases, every word and act besprinkled with poppy-seed and sesame” (1.3), and then he says that *qui inter haec nutriuntur non magis sapere possunt quam bene olere qui in culina habitant*—“people who are fed on this diet can no more have taste (or be wise) than people who live in the kitchen can smell good” (2.1). One can sense here, in the figures of the language, a tone reminiscent of an ancient philosophical polemic against sophism and rhetoric, which had been likened to the (undervalued?) profession of

¹³³ *Sat.* 5 vv. 13–22, *bibat felici pectore fontem. / mox et Socratico plenus grege [...] sic flumine largo / plenus Pierio defundes pectore verba*; 118.6, *civilis ingens opus quisquis atigerit nisi plenus litteris, sub onere labetur*; 126.8, *itaque oratione plandissima plenus [...] inquam*. The *Iolaos* (*POxy* 3010) fragment provides a tantalizing parallel, which comes just before the “gallus” begins addressing Iolaos in Sotadean verse, 9–10, [διδα]γῆς δὲ πλήρ[η]ς γεγρονός ἐπήλθε πρὸς [τὸν Ἰόλαον] — “having become full of learning he went to Iolaos.” Although the text is lacunose, the letters πλήρ[...] show that we have here the same metaphor of being “full” of learning (letters, phrases, words, poetry) before bursting into poetic speech.

¹³⁴ Juvenal speaks of the *farrago* “hodgepodge” of his little book (1.86). Consider also this fragment of Varro’s *Saturae Menippeae* (*Eumenides* XXVIII): “... and we the other schoolmen rise together, our ears saturated from the scholastic banquet and inebriated from the interminable sophistry, but our eyes starving” (*et ceteri scholastici saturis auribus scholica dape atque ebris sophistice aperantologia consurgimus ieunus oculis*). *Satura* was also the name of a dish of mixed ingredients. For a general discussion of food associations and *satura*, see Petersmann 1986, LeMoine 1991, and Gowers 1993.

cooking. This is the thesis that arranging words artfully is, like seasoning food, basically a deception.¹³⁵ But apart from this there is the notion that excessive exposure to artful literature will fragment the student's subject and control over future compositions. Seneca, in a letter dedicated to the practice of literary studies (*Ep.* 84), shows awareness of the possibly negative effects of ancient education through immersion, and strongly advises students to "digest" (*Ep.* 84.7, *concoquere*) the intellectual food they take in through their reading so that it can truly be assimilated into the bloodstream, or the seat of genius (*ingenium*), not just into memory. Many voices singing in harmony is the classical ideal of generic oneness and consonance (*Ep.* 84.9). The digestion is the process of transforming and adapting the miscellany that one reads to the generic law of the new composition—whether that is one's speech or writing—which should ideally level out any signs of alien discourses and make what came in many forms and shapes into a seamless whole.¹³⁶

In the earliest prosimetry the ideal of consonance is deliberately botched, and we are allowed to see the often stark differences between individual components of a work. It is this feature which gives the prosimetric narrator his scatterbrained quality. By eschewing consistency and unity, the mixed discourse not only deprives itself of an authoritative stance, it also subverts conservative and contrived genres by playing with them and subjecting them to jarring juxtapositions. The purpose of this exercise is ultimately to make it all the more obvious how strange and artificial and pompous literary diction and specialized jargon are as compared with common language. This type of prosimetry, though seemingly anarchic in its shape-shifting guise, is therefore not without a center and does possess a casual or nonchalant authority of its own.¹³⁷ The conversational style is at its heart and functions as a sort of non-literary center, which presumably is situated beyond formal language and can therefore serve as a measure of the artificiality of *Kunstsprache*.

¹³⁵ See Conte 1992, 300–312.

¹³⁶ Cf. the words of the crazy poet Eumolpus in 118.5, *curandum est ne sententiae emineant extra corpus orationis expressae, sed intexto vestibus colore niteant*—"care should be taken that the (rhetorical) *sententiae* not be obvious and stand out from the body of the discourse, but be interwoven and shine with the color of the garment."

¹³⁷ Whether PROSiMetry, as opposed to proSiMETRY, is the original function and purpose of the mixed discourse I dare not say with absolute certainty. Practically nothing is left of the works of Menippus and Varro's *Menippean Satires* are all in pieces. In order to determine the function of the mixed discourse we need relatively complete sections of text. Judging from what is extant either fully or partly (*Menippus*, *Iolaos*, *Satyrica*, *Apocolocyntosis*) the basis of the oldest prosimetry was simple prose.

The one type of discourse certainly privileged in this genre is prose, and we should remember that the vast majority of the extant *Satyrice* (and we may assume of the original work) is written in this idiom. The “oral” presentation of the various discourse types found in the *Satyrice* is also what constitutes their unifying quality and shows clearly the generic dominance of the conversational tone of Encolpius’ voice vis-à-vis other types of discourse. His is the central speaker identity, underlying all other *personae* in the work, and therefore it should cause no surprise that all subordinate *personae* speak in forms of conversational language, though the quality and style often differ in accordance with their intended individual traits as characters in the story.

1.2.7 Barbarian, Monstrous, Not Even Human ...

Perhaps the most frequently studied consequence of the “human language” mode of presentation in the *Satyrice* is the well-known colloquial quality of its diction, morphology and syntax. We typically have two distinctions, one internal, between what is spoken in the name of the narrator and the other educated characters and what is spoken in the *personae* of the freedmen, and one external, between the language of the *Satyrice* as a whole and the style of formal literary Latin. If the linguistic analyses of Bendz (1941), Marmorale (1948), Swanson (1963), Dell’Era (1970) and Petersmann (1977) are to be trusted, not only the speeches of the freedmen in the *Cena*, but also Encolpius’ main narrative and the conversations of his peers are rich in colloquialisms. This over-all quality of the language is often used to justify the differentiation from the more elevated literary idiom.

While we are able to determine with some certainty the mode of presentation in the *Satyrice* as “spoken-to-be-heard”, as opposed to “written-to-be-read”, the classification of the language as “colloquial” or “literary” is meaningful only in a relative sense, and depends on our choice of “comparison text” to serve as a typical example of literary language. Because of the antiquity of the subject, all our evidence for spoken Latin comes from written texts, and no written text is so “literary” as to be free of the spoken language. For obvious reasons these categories are never discrete. Moreover, as we have clearly seen in our analysis of the discourse types in the *Satyrice*, the spoken mode of presentation does not exclude literary language, since for the composition of ancient “oral” discourse, whether in prose or in metrical language, a great repertoire of literary bits and pieces was required.

The internal distinction, however, between the utterances of the schooled and un-schooled characters is arrived at by comparing the speech mannerisms of these two different groups in the *Satyrica*. In reading through the work one senses a clear increase in the density of barbarisms and solecisms in the speeches of the un-schooled freedmen. Representing this change by statistical means is fraught with difficulties, but fortunately unnecessary because Encolpius clearly acknowledges and intends this difference. In the *persona* of Echion, who is perhaps the most confident and the least apologetic of Trimalchio's freedmen guests, the story-teller addresses Agamemnon, the rhetor, in this fashion (46.2):

“Videris mihi, Agamemnon, dicere: ‘quid iste argutat molestus?’ quia tu, qui potes loquere, non loquis. non es nostrae fasciae, et ideo pauperorum verba derides. scimus te prae litteras fatuum esse.”

“Agamemnon, it seems to me that you are saying: ‘Why is this tiring fellow prattling on?’ Well, it’s because you, who know how to speak, don’t say anything. You’re not made of our stuff, and so you make fun of how we poor bastards talk. But we know that you’ve become silly from literature.”

This obviously defines the categories of the freedmen’s speech versus that of the scholars in terms of literary and non-literary, or schooled and un-schooled. The same is expressed by the words of another freedman in Trimalchio’s party, Niceros, before he begins his werewolf-story: *timeo istos scholasticos, ne me derideant* —“I fear those scholastics, that they will mock me” (61.4). No external context or comparison text is really necessary to explain what characterizes this style with respect to the rest of the narrative, or why Encolpius has introduced this feature into his lively account of Trimalchio’s dinner-party. Nevertheless, scholars have often attempted to use external material (e.g., the apparently conversational language of Cicero’s and Seneca’s letters or the ungrammatical language of Pompeian graffiti) to fix a supposedly absolute and historical classification of the two levels of spoken language in the *Satyrica*. The use of such external contexts is often accompanied by certain assumptions about the purpose of this style, assumptions that sometimes ignore the indications in the *Satyrica* itself as to its intended significance.

Ever since the rediscovery of the Traguriensis manuscript by Marino Statileo, in the middle of the seventeenth century, scholars have debated the significance of the strange language of the *Satyrica*. Initially the question of

language was raised in relation to the debate over the authenticity of the *Cena* manuscript.¹³⁸ Johan Christoph Wagenseil remarked that the *barbara, monstrosa, immo ne humana quidem*—“barbarian, monstrous, not even human” vocabulary of the *Satyrica*, especially in the speeches of the freedmen, could not possibly have come from the pen of the *elegantiae Arbitrator*, and tried to show that the real author had to be familiar with modern Italian. The biographical bias of the argument is obvious and Wagenseil makes no allowance for the possibility that the author might have imitated linguistic manners that were uncharacteristic for his own historical person. On the basis of this position, Wagenseil concluded that the new fragment of Petronius was not by Petronius, and not even by a Roman, but an obvious forgery perpetrated by the Italian Statileo himself.¹³⁹

It is here that we witness the invention of the anachronistic Petronian criteria of style that have exerted so much influence on the literary and the textual criticism of the *Satyrica*. While Tacitus, in his necrology of the Roman consular C. Petronius (*Ann.* 16.18), refers ironically to *elegantiae arbitrator* as his supposed fancy title within Nero’s court and indicates that its true meaning was “expert at devising perverse pleasures”, the language and style-fixated humanists had something other and more specific in mind when writing about Petronian *elegantia*. A key figure for understanding the meaning of the word *elegantia* in humanist Latin is the Italian humanist Lorenzo Valla (d. 1457) whose seminal book *De linguae Latinae elegantia libri sex* attempted for the first time ever to give a description of the *usus* or Latin usage of classical Roman authors. The work was enormously ambitious and it was intended to replace all earlier (mostly medieval) grammatical treatises, but even more importantly it laid the fundamentals for a new subject: historical linguistics. An important part of the treatise was historical in nature and contained the theory of the cyclic change of Latin style from coarse beginnings through refinement and classical perfection in the time of Cicero to degeneration and downfall at the end of antiquity and the beginning of the middle ages. The development of Latin, Valla claimed, kept pace with the growth and decline of the Roman Empire, and he thus substantiated the persistent humanist notion of a correlation between the quality of the language (the style) and the state of the culture.¹⁴⁰ It is this work’s enormously influential

¹³⁸ In the following exposition of the scholarly literature on the language of the *Satyrica* I owe much to Bret Boyce’s survey of the scholarship (Boyce 1991, 14–34).

¹³⁹ Wagenseil’s treatise is the former of the two *Dissertationes de Cena Trimalchionis nuper sub Petronii nomine vulgata* (orig. edn. Paris 1666) that were reprinted in Burman 1743, 2:342–350.

¹⁴⁰ Lindberg 1993, 54–55.

thesis about the rise and fall of Latin *elegantia* with all the connotations the word had gathered through the humanist project which forms the background of Wagenseil's denial of the possibility that a text like the *Cena*, full of barbarisms and solecisms, could possibly have been written by an ancient Roman author.

Adrien de Valois, whose study appeared together with that of Wagenseil and under the same title,¹⁴¹ argued along similar lines. Whoever wrote the *Cena Trimalchionis*, he claimed, had to be a native speaker of—this time—French, though for de Valois, the colloquial language of the narrative and the Grecisms of the Longer Fragments indicated that Petronius lived under the Antonines and was himself indeed a Gaul from Massalia (see more on Massalia below). Again the premise of the argument is that the persona of the speaker in the narrative of the *Satyrica* is throughout none other than the historical author, Petronius Arbiter. This assumption then leads to certain expectations about the style appropriate to the author's historical persona, expectations which are ultimately determined by a comparative reading of the *Cena* with Tacitus and Valla as comparison texts. A notable characteristic of their approach is the completely new attempt to classify the strange language of the work by introducing a non-Latin “comparison text”, in both cases the written texts of the Romance vernaculars. From the context we may glean that although the Romance languages had by then come into their own as written languages, they were still in the eyes of these learned men regarded as corrupt Latin.

A quick reply to these attacks on the authenticity of the Traguriensis manuscript was published the same year (1666) in Paris under the name of Marino Statileo himself.¹⁴² This treatise correctly stresses that the language of the freedmen deviates from the language of the other characters because of the inferior level of their schooling and literacy, and claims moreover that Petronius deliberately wrote thus to make the language suit his characters (*personae*). The author of this reply notes that the new Traguriensis manuscript contains such peculiar language, while the previously known Longer Fragments (L) don't, for the reason that only in the episode of the dinner-party is conversation dominated by uneducated freedmen.¹⁴³ The author of the treatise shows a good understanding of the fact that the historical identity of Petronius as such is irrelevant to the language of the freedmen, which should instead be explained by reference to the ancient criteria of appropri-

¹⁴¹ Reprinted in Burman 1743, 2:350–358.

¹⁴² Reprinted in Burman 1743, 2:359–379. The reply may not have been written by Statileo, but by Pierre Petit of the *Pléade latine*; according to Gaselee 1909, 171.

¹⁴³ Burman 1743, 2:367.

ateness in *sermocinatio*.¹⁴⁴ The assumption, that apart from the freedmen all characters in the *Satyrica* are urbane and educated, may not be fully accurate, but it is certainly correct that of the extant episodes only the *Cena* allows uneducated characters to make longish statements.¹⁴⁵

Another important seventeenth-century dissertation under the name of Statileo, but actually composed by Giovanni Lucio,¹⁴⁶ introduced the question of Vulgar Latin into the scholarship on the *Satyrica*. By noting the similarity of the language of the *Satyrica* to the Vulgate and to the Romance languages, the scholar postulated that the colloquial language of the work was actually derived from the way Latin was spoken at the time by common uneducated people. However, in Lucio's mind, what prompted Petronius to imitate this idiom was by no means the desire to document the language of the people, but an urge to ridicule and "to laugh until his tears flowed, together with the educated and elegant men who were present at that dinner party".¹⁴⁷ In the story, however, it is not Petronius who laughed at the freedmen, but the character Ascyltos, as is clear from the fact that Lucio's language imitates *Sat.* 57.1.¹⁴⁸ Besides, this interpretation obscures the fact that the jokes of the *Cena Trimalchionis* are told no less at the expense of the parasitic and clownish *scholastici*. There is no question that the narrator Encolpius agrees with the mordant wit of Echion, when he states in his unschooled manner that the scholastics have lost their senses from excessive study of bad literature. Such is, as we have seen, the basic philosophy of prosimetry.

In general it is the character of this seventeenth-century debate to treat the language of the freedmen not as an idiom on its own, which might be worth studying, but merely as an aberration from the correct Latin of Cicero and other exemplary authorities on matters of style. It took the intense romantic nationalism of the nineteenth century to prod German philologists into finding in *vulgaris sermo* not just low "vulgarities" but the *Volks-*

¹⁴⁴ The author asks, justly outraged: "But what is this stupidity, not to notice what is appropriate to the characters that Petronius portrays?" (*Quae autem haec inscitia est, ne animadvertere quidem, quid personis, quas Petronius exhibet, conveniat?* Burman 1743, 2.373).

¹⁴⁵ The character Bargates speaks "in a raving and barbaric voice" (96.5, *rabiosa barbaraque voce*).

¹⁴⁶ *Apologia ad patres conscripti reip(ublicae) litterariae Marini Statilei Traguriensis*, first published in Blaeu's edition (Amsterdam 1670), and then reprinted in Burman 1743, 2:379–394.

¹⁴⁷ Burman 1743, 2:387.

¹⁴⁸ *Sat.* 57.1, *ceterum Ascyltos, intemperantis licentiae, cum omnia sublatis manibus eluderet et usque ad lacrimas rideret* ("But Ascyltos, unruly and out of control as usual, kept throwing his hands up ridiculing everything and laughing until his tears flowed").

sprache, “the language of the people”, and so to make this formerly disreputable idiom worthy of study in its own right.¹⁴⁹

The first study to approach the question of language in the *Satyrical* from this modern perspective is an article of G. Studer (1849) praising Petronius as practically the only Roman author who “has left behind for us a written document” (*der uns ein schriftliches Document [...] hinterlassen hat*) of the *Volkssprache* that was spoken by the overwhelming majority of uneducated Romans, in the military and among the colonists of the provinces, where it later developed into the various Romance languages. The importance of Petronius as a document for this idiom is said by Studer to be even greater because of the loss of all works which, like the mimes and Atellans, belonged to the “base and comic national literature” (*der niedrigkomischen Nationallitteratur*). A new ideological agenda is clearly afoot in this study that reveals itself in terms like *Volkssprache*, *Document* and *Nationallitteratur*. Studer’s article marks a radical shift in the discussion of the language of the freedmen and involves a fundamental departure from the humanist premises of the seventeenth century.¹⁵⁰

As Bret Boyce points out,¹⁵¹ several major projects now influenced the debate on the *Satyrical*’s language: G. Fiorelli’s archeological excavations of Pompeii (begun 1860); the publication of Bücheler’s new edition of the text (1862); the publication of the epigraphic evidence in the *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum* (1863); and the publication of Hugo Schuchardt’s three volume study of the *sermo plebeius* (1866–1868). As the result of this development we have, moreover, a doctoral dissertation by Arminius von Guericke, *De linguae vulgaris reliquiis apud Petronium et in inscriptionibus parietariis Pompeianis* (1875), which compares the language of the freedmen to the graffiti on the walls of ancient Pompeii. The conclusion of this study, however, is that the language of the *Satyrical*, though interspersed with vulgar forms, including the poetry, is not a faithful representation of the contemporary Latin spoken by the lower classes. According to von Guericke this is so because of the constraints on the author to entertain an educated audience. This negative conclusion was, of course, predictable, because no one in

¹⁴⁹ The first German ideologue to regard language as such as the most significant expression of the *Volksgeist* was Johann Gottfried Herder (b. 1744, d.1803), but after the 1806 Prussian defeat at Jena, his ideas were disseminated in the more aggressive form given them by Johann Gottlieb Fichte in his *Reden an die deutsche Nation*, which he delivered in Berlin in the winter of 1807–1808.

¹⁵⁰ See section 3.2.2 for a fuller discussion of the influence of nationalism on Petronian scholarship.

¹⁵¹ Boyce 1991, 14–34.

the first century C.E. would have seen any point in giving a faithful representation of the language of the common people. The rationale for doing so did not exist until the nineteenth century.

The archeological evidence and interest in historical linguistics (and the centrality of language in the ideologies related to the contemporary consolidation of national states in Europe) tended to obscure rather than to clarify the specific logic of the presentation of linguistic characterization in the *Satyrica*. Wilhelm Süß was the first modern scholar to draw attention to the important difference between the modern and the ancient approaches to Vulgar Latin as it related to the *Satyrica*. In two Latin treatises, *De eo quem dicunt inesse Trimalchionis cenae sermone vulgari* (1926) and *Petronii imitatio sermonis plebei qua necessitate coniungatur cum grammatica illius aetatis doctrina* (1927), he tries to differentiate the study of Latin historical linguistics from the study of the specific reasons behind the imitation of speech characteristics in the *Satyrica*, which he emphasizes as being the more important for understanding the work.¹⁵²

Barbaric and solecistic language in the *Satyrica* should be read and interpreted in the context of those passages in the work where the language of the freedmen is defined as un-schooled and ridiculous in the eyes of the scholastics. According to that context the speeches of the freedmen are there to form an antithesis to the correct Latin of the schools.¹⁵³ Encolpius' attempt to imitate the language of the freedmen is surely called for because of the presence of the *scholastici* at the dinner party of Trimalchio. What tempts him to undertake this exercise in *mimetismo* is the contrast between these two groups. The episode is a sort of Saturnalian reversal of roles, where scholars and orators are kept silent to allow those who violate the protocols of respectable public speech to ramble on in their "shameful" and "low" manner. Süß is also correct in arguing against the idea that Petronius tried to imitate the speech mannerisms of those who had Latin as their second language.¹⁵⁴ Grecisms are widespread throughout the *Satyrica* and we may rest assured that if Encolpius had intended to ridicule the freedmen especially for their use of Grecisms he would somehow have indicated as much.

Wilhelm Süß makes it the starting point of his latter thesis to investigate the ancient grammatical theory of barbarisms and solecisms. His conclusion is that the language of the freedmen displays many of the features known to

¹⁵² Süß 1926, 3: ... *non modo grammaticis singula esse ex historia et necessitate orationis latinae interpretanda, sed et philologis quaerendum esse, quo sit ductus consilio scriptor et qua sit usus ratione in coloribus vulgaribus dicendi et eligendis et distribuendis.*

¹⁵³ For a discussion of ancient schoolmen and society, see Kaster 1988.

¹⁵⁴ This view was held, for example, by Salonijs 1927.

grammarians as incorrect, although he avoids making this the only source and says that in creating the language of the freedmen the author “employed sharp wit together with learned practice and the design of his art in order that all might seem casual and haphazard”.¹⁵⁵ Süß thus relies on the study of the external context of Vulgar Latin only in so far as it supports the internal mode of presentation. This approach has the great advantage of respecting the *Satyrica*’s own explanation of the significance and purpose of the language of the freedmen, i.e. of reading those passages in the context of the rest of the fragments.

It is simply anachronistic to assign to the author of the *Satyrica* an interest in imitating the language of the common people for the sake of realism or documentation, although this has been the unexamined assumption of modern scholars who have studied *Volkssprache* in the *Satyrica*.¹⁵⁶ In the section above we accounted for this reading as determined by the context of the other extant ancient prose fiction in Latin, the *Metamorphoses* of Apuleius, and pointed out that as an interpretive approach it shares many basic assumptions and premises with the general study of national literatures. Although modern scholars are obviously free to use any ancient text as a linguistic document to support their theories about the vulgar idiom of ancient Latin, the assumption should be resisted that the peculiar language of the unschooled characters of the *Satyrica* is there for the reason that scholars wish to study it.

If we are to revise the historical context of the colloquial language of the *Satyrica* to dissociate the work from such texts as the Vulgate or the graffiti at Pompeii, the most obvious replacement for these traditional “comparison texts” should be looked for in the appropriately general and theoretical ancient discussion of styles. Here, indeed, we find in the lowest of the three stylistic characters, as defined by the *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, a text which shares many of the linguistic peculiarities of the *Satyrica*, but more importantly defines a type of style the wrong use of which can accommodate a density of barbarisms and solecisms of the kind we find in the freedmen’s problematic discourse. This Latin treatise from the first century B.C.E. pro-

¹⁵⁵ Süß 1927, 5, *miscuisse innata acumina ingenii cum usu eruditionis et consiliis artis ita, ut omnia nescio quam simulationem temeritatis haberent.*

¹⁵⁶ Boyce 1991, 24, whose study has been useful to me for its thoroughness in surveying the scholarship, seems to believe that Petronius’ purpose was to document the linguistic mannerisms of the underclass, and he agrees with the negative and dismissive treatment of Süß’s thesis: *In der Cena haben wir doch nichts anderes als ein von unerreichter Meisterhand geschaffenes Abbild der damaligen Volkssprache, wozu ein dürres System von Vitiagruppen eines Grammatikers nichts beigetragen hat* (quoted by Boyce).

vides us indeed with an example of “plain speech”, *sermo adtenuatus* or *figura extenuata*, which reads like a lost passage from the *Satyrice*:

Nam ut forte hic in balneas venit, coepit, postquam perfusus est, defricari; deinde, ubi visum est ut in alveum descenderet, ecce tibi iste de traverso: “Heus,” inquit, “adolescens, pueri tui modo me pulsarunt; satis facias oportet.” Hic, qui id aetatis ab ignoto praeter consuetudinem appellatus esset, erubuit. Iste clarius eadem et alia dicere coepit. Hic vix: “Tamen,” inquit, “sine me considerare.” Tum vero iste clamare voce ista quae perfacile cuivis rubores eicere potest; ita petulans est atque acerba: ne ad solarium quidem, ut mihi videtur, sed pone scaenam et in eiusmodi locis exercitata. Conturbatus est adolescens; nec mirum, cui etiam nunc pedagogi lites ad oriculas versarentur inperito huiusmodi conviciorum. Ubi enim iste vidisset scurram exhausto rubore, qui se putaret nihil habere quod de existimatione perderet, ut omnia sine famae detrimento facere posset? (*Rhet. Her.* 4.10)

Now our friend happened to enter the baths, and, after washing, was beginning to be rubbed down. Then, just as he decided to go down into the pool, suddenly this fellow turned up. “Say, young chap,” said he, “your slave boys have just beat me; you must make it good.” The young man grew red, for at his age he was not used to being hailed by a stranger. This creature started to shout the same words, and more, in a louder voice. With difficulty the youth replied: “Well, but let me look into the matter.” Right then the fellow cries out in that tone of his that might well force blushes from any one; this is how aggressive and harsh it is—a tone certainly not practiced in the neighborhood of the Sundial, I would say, but backstage, and in places of that kind. The young man was embarrassed. And no wonder, for his ears still rang with the scolding of his tutor, and he was not used to abusive language of this kind. For where would he have seen a buffoon, with not a blush left, who thought of himself as having no good name to lose, so that he could do anything he liked without damage to his reputation? (trans. Caplan)

In the example we note that the author of the treatise marks the tone of voice and gesture appropriate to the stylistic category of plain speech: The clamorous shouting of the *scurra* as well as the young man’s blushing. There is also an appropriate linguistic setting in the baths, which the moralizing narrator—*ut mihi videtur*—classifies with the “backstage and such places” and contrasts with the language of finer locations at the Sundial. The contrast be-

tween the young and noble youth and the shameless *scurra* defines the style in terms of social class. The tone of voice and gesture, the color of the setting, and the difference in social status between the two characters, all of this contributes to marking the passage as “low” or “thin” (*sermo adtenuatus*) and free of ornament. Without these narratorial comments a formal stylistic analysis is worth little, for the simple reason that the meaning of linguistic features in literature is primarily dependent on context, viz. who is speaking, where and why.¹⁵⁷

Not even Caplan’s excellent translation above may do justice to the style of the passage, whose characteristics are, according to definition, the absence of rhetorical embellishment and the quick-witted and streetwise use of language (*facetissima verborum adtenuatione*).¹⁵⁸ Accordingly, the language of this style may freely sink to the lowest everyday usage (4.10, *ad infimum et cotidianum sermonem demissum*). The middle style steers clear of it by abstaining from the basest and thoroughly vulgar vocabulary (*Rhet. Her.* 4.8, *ex infima et pervulgatissima verborum dignitate*). In the example given by the rhetorical treatise the colloquial forms come from the narrator himself (the anonymous author of the treatise) and not merely in his mimicking of the *scurra*. The whole point of the base style is to lower the dignity of the discourse down to the street level. The “thin” style certainly works as a description of the language Encolpius uses in his informal narrative and speeches put in the mouth of most of the characters, but can it accommodate the barbarisms and solecisms of his language when he dons the masks of the freedmen in the *Cena*? The answer to this question seems to be negative, because elsewhere the treatise defines correct Latinity, *Latinitas*, as the basis of any appropriate and finished example of each of the three stylistic regis-

¹⁵⁷ Harry Caplan, the editor and translator of the Loeb text, conveniently summarizes how scholars have tried to point to specific formal (lexical, morphological and syntactical) stylistic features of the passage to justify its classification by the author of the *Rhetorica ad Herennium*. He mentions “the forms of colloquial usage (*pedagogi*, the diminutive *oriculas*), idioms like *de traverso*, *coepit* with the passive, the vulgar use of the archaism *pone* for *post*, and of the indicative *potest* in a characterizing clause, the expletive use as in conversation of the ethical dative *tibi* with *ecce*, the frequent use of the demonstrative *iste* for *hic* or *is*, the accusative of quality in *id aetatis*, the asyndeton in *satis facias oportet*, and the type of parataxis characteristic of comedy in *ita petulans est ... exercitata*”; Caplan also mentions the exclamations *heus*, *ei* in the sense of *efferre*, the phrase *quod de existimatione perderet*, and the brevity of *Hic vix*. Such formal analysis is interesting in itself but cannot ultimately explain the significance of the language in the passage (words and forms can signify many things, e.g. archaic or vulgar) which is primarily defined by the classification provided by the context in which it occurs, i.e. the rhetorical, social, and ethical theory of the *Rhetorica ad Herennium*.

¹⁵⁸ *Rhet. Her.* 4.11.

ters. And barbarisms and solecisms happen to be the two faults in language that lessen the purity of the Latin language.¹⁵⁹ We must therefore conclude that the correct use of the “thin” style would apparently not allow the language of the freedmen.

The Greco-Roman theory of stylistics put forward in the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* names grammatically correct Latinity as one of the two cornerstones of literary taste, *elegantia*. Although the subject is *Latinitas*, the terminology is nevertheless adapted from Greek stylistics, either directly, as in the Grecisms *barbarismus* and *soloecismus*, by translation, as in the calque *elegantia* (ἔκλογῆ ὀνομάτων), or by neologism, as in the term *Latinitas* (corresponding to Ἑλληνισμός). It goes without saying that the thesis of *Latinitas* as a prerequisite for *elegantia* can potentially have devastating consequences for Petronian *elegantia*. For, unless we regard the singularly barbaric and solecistic language of the freedmen merely as a demonstration of bad taste, we must conclude that according to the theory the author of the *Satyrica* has written a text that is the very antithesis of “elegant”. This realization should, however, not come as a surprise to us, because Encolpius has told us as much through his narrative, i.e. that the language of the freedmen is the very opposite of the language of the *scholastici*.

Fortunately for our ability to read the *Satyrica* in the context of rhetorical theory, the opposite of what is desired and taught in schools is also articulated in the theoretical literature. For each of the three styles the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* has an example of the incorrect use of that style. These examples are certainly not provided for imitation but rather for pedagogical reasons, in order that the orator may know what to avoid. Nevertheless, the unknown author of the treatise has himself composed these examples of *oratio vitiosa* not because he lapsed into vice (as he warns the reader not to do) but because he, like Petronius, purposefully broke the rules of correct

¹⁵⁹ *Rhet. Her.* 4.17, *Elegantia est, quae facit, ut <locus> unus quisque pure et aperte dici videatur. Haec tribuitur in Latinitatem et explanationem. Latinitas est, quae sermonem purum conservat, ab omni vitio remotum. Vitia in sermone, quo minus is Latinus sit, duo possunt esse: soloecismus et barbarismus. Soloecismus est, cum in verbis pluribus consequens verbum superius non a<d>commodatur. Barbarismus est, cum verbis al<iquid> vitiose effertur. Haec qua ratione vitare possimus in arte grammatica dilucide dicemus (“Elegantia is what makes each and every passage seem spoken with purity and openness. *Elegantia* is subdivided into *Latinitas* and clarity. *Latinitas* is what keeps the language pure, and free of any fault. The faults in language which make the language less Latin, are two: solecism and barbarism. Solecism is when the concord between a word and one before it in a group of words is faulty [i.e. ungrammatical phrases]. Barbarism is when the verbal expression is incorrect [i.e. faulty word forms]. We shall explain clearly in the grammar how to avoid these”).*

Latinity for the sake of demonstration and art. The example of the incorrect use of the “thin” style runs as follows:

Nam *istic* in balineis accessit ad hunc; postea dicit: “Hic tuus servus me pulsavit.” Postea dicit hic illi: “Considerabo.” Post ille convicium fecit et magis magisque praesente multis clamavit. (*Rhet. Her* 4.16)

Now that guy came up to this one in the baths. After that he says: “This your slave boy beat me.” After that this one says to the other one: “I’ll think about it.” Afterwards the other one called him names and shouted louder and louder, while a lot of peoples were present.

I should state that my rendering (inspired by Caplan’s) is supposed to represent the bad Latin. We notice immediately that this text is intended as a failed attempt, an incompetent blurt, at relating the same encounter of the young innocent with the *scurra* at the baths. In fact, it is a successful and competent demonstration of the erroneous style. The diction here shows that, even if the correct use of the *sermo adtenuatus* doesn’t, its incorrect use certainly *does* allow the indignities inflicted on the Latin language by the freedmen at Trimalchio’s table. Despite the brevity—it is much shorter than the example of correct *sermo adtenuatus* given earlier—this example of *vitiosa oratio* nevertheless features inadmissible infractions against correct Latinity. What is the violation of the concord of number in *praesente multis* for *praesentibus multis* but a solecism? Apart from the obviously ungrammatical it is difficult to determine exactly what else in this short passage the author of the treatise classified as barbaric or solecistic.¹⁶⁰ But we know for certain that he saw here further violations of *Latinitas*, because he adds the comment that his passage “has not achieved the quality that belongs to the “thin” style, viz. a speech composed of pure and chosen words” (*Rhet. Her.* 4.16, *non enim est adeptus id quod habet adtenuata figura, puris et electis verbis conpositam orationem*). If this interesting example were longer, it would no doubt have presented a rich source for the students of Latin *Volks-sprache*. The treatise even characterizes this way of speaking as *sermo inliberalis*, “the language of the un-free.” We have moved to the bottom of the social ladder, to the barbaric and solecistic language of slaves and former slaves.

¹⁶⁰ Caplan again points amongst other things to “the vulgar locution *convicium facere*, the abuse of the demonstrative in *istic, hunc, hic, hic, illi, ille*, the monotonous transitions, the awkward parataxis and short sentences, the employment thrice of *post* or *postea*.”

The example of *vitiosa oratio* or *sermo vitiosus* in the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* shows that the language of the freedmen is a known category of *verkehrte Sprache* in the theoretical literature. Furthermore, the speeches of the freedmen at the *Cena* are not the only demonstrations Encolpius gives of the incorrect use of a stylistic *genus*. In the opening of the text of the *Satyrica* as we have it, Encolpius gives us an example of the reverse of the *figura gravis* or *sermo gravis*, the highest or most weighty of the three *genera* according to the *Rhetorica ad Herennium*. Such is Encolpius' example:

haec vulnera pro libertate publica excepi, hunc oculum pro vobis impendi; date mihi ducem qui me ducat ad liberos meos, nam succisi poplites membra non sustinent. (*Sat.* 1.1)

These wounds have I sustained for people's liberty, this eye have I for thee forfeited. Give me a leader to lead me to my children, for my hamstringed legs cannot uphold my limbs.

The ideal that is deliberately botched here is accurately described by Encolpius in accordance with the theory of styles as *grandis oratio*, and with equal scholarly acumen he calls its vicious reverse *turgida oratio* (*Sat.* 2.6; cf. 1.2. *tumore*), which is the very same terminology that is used by the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* (4.15, *turget; tumor*). Such theoretical precision is surely a sign that in the *Satyrica* we are dealing with a text that can profitably be read in the context of the ancient schools of rhetoric and their theory of styles.

It is tempting to put our observation about the reverse elegance of the prose style of the *Satyrica* in context with the exceedingly problematic poetics of our text. Catherine Connors has recently devoted a book to the study of Petronius as a poet and her findings throughout the study confirm the flaws of the *Satyrica*'s poetic compositions: "As everyone will agree, the short poems on moralizing or erotic themes performed by Trimalchio, and Eumolpus, and Encolpius (both as character and as narrator) represent utterly conventional habits of thought".¹⁶¹ Likewise, "the obsessive display within the *Troiae Halosis* of repetition, likeness, and imperfect re-enactment signifies ... Eumolpus' lack of literary control".¹⁶² The same is true of the longest verse section of the *Satyrica*, the so-called *Bellum Civile* (*Sat.* 119–24). It compares poorly with other examples of the genre: "Virgil, Lucan or Statius

¹⁶¹ Connors 1998, 50.

¹⁶² Connors 1998, 93.

can brilliantly rework inherited motifs: so far as I can tell Eumolpus' poem offers dim, overly studied transformations of tradition."¹⁶³

Connors persuasively argues that the restraint and elegance of Callimachean esthetics, traditionally expressed in the metaphors of the untrodden path and the narrow stream, as opposed to the well-trodden one and a flood of water, are explicitly rejected by Eumolpus in the theoretical preface to his poem on the civil war. This, along with other evidence advanced by Connors, indicates that the pretentious Mr. Sing-Well (the Greek verb εὐμολπεῖν from which the name Eumolpus is formed means to "sing well") is meant to expose himself as a bad poet, according to the best contemporary standard, neo-Callimachean poetics. Now, Connors also recognizes Eumolpus as "a figure of metaliterary dimensions, reflecting Petronius' own enterprise in crafting the novel", and so she logically concludes by saying: "Over and over again, in becoming a poet Petronius acknowledges the limits of the poetry he leaves behind."¹⁶⁴

If we try to enter this debate on Connors' premise as if the aim of our inquiry were to tease out of the text the intentions of the author in writing it, we must ask why Petronius would want to write *deliberately* flawed poetry? Surely, we can assume that he was capable of writing good poetry. Connor writes: "To choose a genre, even one as loosely defined as prose fiction, is to reject all the others ... by producing verse within his fictional prose, Petronius sets his novel in a self-consciously agonistic relationship with the literary genres which he has repudiated."¹⁶⁵ As we have seen above the prosimetric/Menippean *Satyricon* indeed not only sets prose "in a self-consciously agonistic relationship" with the poetry, it uses *sermo ad-tenuatus*—at last we have a name for it!—this urban and educated idiom in which most of the *Satyricon* is written, as an ideal medium. And it puts everything else in an "agonistic relationship" with it, also the various examples of *verkehrte Sprache* that we find in this text. While the students of the schools of declamation, like those who are trained to extemporize poetry, have been fed on a bad diet, and are worse off than the oldies Sophocles, Euripides, Pindar, Plato and Demosthenes who never practiced declamation (*Sat.* 3.3–6), the freedmen who have no education are just as badly off. Neither group has mastery over the ideal medium of spoken language, which is the prerequisite for making sense. It is as if this whole philosophy of colloquial language was based on the Aristotelian theory of vicious excesses and a golden

¹⁶³ Connors 1998, 102.

¹⁶⁴ Connors 1998, 143–146.

¹⁶⁵ Connors 1998, 147.

mean, coupled with a notably conservative preference for the Greek, the old, the established and the classical.

At the same time, however, Encolpius uses his demonstrations of *vitiosa oratio* as a vehicle to express critical ideas that are as subversive in thought as they are mangled in form. Though it may sound slightly absurd, the misshapen and ugly creatures of artistic processes are sometimes more revealing of the nature of those processes, and the underlying assumptions involved, than the most successful and complete works of art. This is evidently the reason behind the ancient fascination with messy and destructive parody. By creating deliberately bad art, in the manner and style of a recognizable individual or school, the truth hiding behind the facade of beauty with which polished art is varnished is better exposed. The target can also be merely hypothetical, but this does not preclude the sense of recognition which makes its reception such an interesting and enjoyable experience.¹⁶⁶

Where impersonation in the *Satyrical* involves infractions against *Latinitas*, at least in comparison with the proper *sermo adtenuatus* of the general narrative, this relative difference does not allow us to assign the main narrative to the category of formal literary style. At the same time we should be wary not to separate literary language entirely from spoken language, since the two obviously overlap and are far from being discrete classes. Certain types of formal “spoken” discourses existed in antiquity, both in prose and meter, which demanded a vast literary repertoire. In contrast to Encolpius, Lucius in the *Metamorphoses* uses a more elevated literary style—notwithstanding his pretense to speak as a foreigner who first acquired Latin as an adult—which puts him above colloquialisms and ungrammatical Latinity. This is why Lucius and his subordinate *personae* all speak in an artificial and peculiarly literary manner.¹⁶⁷ The difference seems to correlate with what we have noted previously, that there is a fundamental distinction in the mode of presentation in the *Satyrical* and the *Metamorphoses*; one is performance literature while the other presents itself as a written text to be read aloud by a solitary reader to himself.

¹⁶⁶ Eumolpus’ ephrastic *Troiae Halosis* (*Sat.* 89) has often been compared to the tragedies of Seneca, and is sometimes analyzed in the context of Neronian aesthetics. The same character’s *Bellum Civile* (*Sat.* 119–24) is, as a rule, compared to Lucan’s *Pharsalia*. Agamemnon’s verses in the Lucilian style, at *Sat.* 5, have also been related to the satires of Persius. For specific references to scholarship on this much discussed topic, consult e.g. Connors’ 1998 vast bibliography (pp. 149–61).

¹⁶⁷ For a model of the narrative speaker-personae in the *Metamorphoses* of Apuleius of the kind we showed for Encolpius and his “masks”, see section 3.1.4 below and Jensson 2002.

It is pertinent to this whole question to consider the common denominator of those ancient works of literature that include linguistic mimicry, whether of regional dialects, foreign languages or vulgar idioms. The relevant material was collected by Boyce,¹⁶⁸ who lists such examples as the “Persian” of the *Persians* of Aeschylus; the crude patois of the Phrygian or Persian captive in the fragment of the *Persians* of Timotheus (dated ca. 419–416 B.C.E.); the imitation of the Boeotian and Megarian dialects in Aristophanes’ *Acharnians*; the Laconian in the *Lysistrata*; the Thracian gibberish of the *Birds*; the solecistic Greek of the Scythian archer in the *Thesmophoriazusae*; the “Indian” and the ranting monologue of the vengeful woman in a fragment of subliterate mime (*POxy* 413, No. 76 [Page]); the general imitation of colloquial language in Plautus’ plays; the “Punic” of the *Poenulus*; and finally the “vulgar” diction of the Atellan farces of L. Pomponius and Novius, as well as the mimes or *fabulae riciniatae* of D. Laberius, Publilius Syrus, and Cn. Matius.

Boyce ends his survey by concluding, “realistic literary depiction of the speech of commoners (and, we may add, of barbarians) is confined to the comic mode.” Some of his own examples, however, are obviously not comedy, but come from tragic plays (Aeschylus, Timotheus) and to Boyce’s list one could add the “Phrygian” in Euripides’ *Orestes*, and the “Egyptian” in Aeschylus’ *Suppliants*.¹⁶⁹ Instead of the “comic mode” we prefer to see the common denominator in all of these examples as “theatricality”, since in every instance we are dealing with plays, written for performance in theaters and for an audience. The exclusive use of linguistic *mimetismo* in performance literature would therefore seem to support our contention that the *Satyrica* was composed for performance.¹⁷⁰

Although direct evidence of the performance of novelistic narratives is scarce,¹⁷¹ some indications are found in Lucian’s *Pseudologista*. The outspo-

¹⁶⁸ Boyce 1991, 3–14.

¹⁶⁹ From comedy one could add the “Ionian” in Aristophanes’ *Peace* and the Apulian calyx crater by the Tarporley painter (New York Metropolitan Museum of Art, No. 24.97.104). A reproduction can be found in Taplin 1993, plate 10.2.

¹⁷⁰ Much the same could be said of the Iolaos (*POxy* 3010), and the Tinouphis (*PHaun*. inv. 400) papyrus fragments which like the *Satyrica* contain “a number of vulgarisms and uncorrected errors in both the prose and the verse sections of the text” (Stephens and Winkler 1995, 367).

¹⁷¹ There is, however, the mention of *aretalogi*, tellers of marvelous survival tales in the style of Odysseus’ lying Phaeacian tales (cf. Juv. 15.16; Manetho 4.447, ἐν δ’ ἀρεταλογία μυθεύματα ποικίλ’ ἔχοντας; and Lucian *Merc. Cond.* 1f. and *V.H.* 1.3), as regular entertainers at Augustus’ dinner parties (Suet. *Aug.* 74), who are probably the same as the *lectores* and *fabulatores* of the household to whom the emperor listened if he could not sleep (*ibid.*

ken sophist here impersonates the figure of “Reproach” (Ἐλεγχος) to blast his enemy for delivering in Olympia, at a New Year’s festival, an “improvisation” which was supposedly plagiarized from others and completely memorized beforehand. (What seems to have maddened Lucian especially was that the performer managed to turn his heckling against him and roused the laughter of the audience—unfairly, perhaps, but successfully.) The improvisation in question was a mixture of prose and poetry (ὁ μὲν τὴν φωνὴν ἐντρέψας ἐς μέλος [“his voice switching to song”]),¹⁷² and Lucian’s enemy, who according to him was a great sexual pervert, had first gained his reputation as a theatrical performer by impersonating Ninos and Metiochus.¹⁷³ The juxtaposition of these two names of the male protagonists from the very earliest Greek novels (probably first cent. B.C.E.)¹⁷⁴ may provide some evidence of where, how and by whom the ancient novels were recited. Although neither of these two works seems to have been prosimetric or to have included linguistic mimicry, evidence that even fictional narratives without such features were recited in the theater may indirectly support our belief that a work such as the *Satyrice*, which is theatrical in its narrative style, was in fact composed for performance.¹⁷⁵

It may seem at first that all written texts are equally suited for literary recital in front of an audience, but it is not that simple. Certain texts include features that would make performance awkward. Consider, for example, how Thucydides’ statement that his work was composed for posterity and not for a public recital might sound if read in front of an audience. Another example of performance-unfriendly figures is Lucius’ many personal addresses to a single *lector* in the *Metamorphoses*. These would certainly sound awkward if they came from the mouth of a public reciter of the work; the reader, impersonating Lucius, would appear to be talking to another aspect of himself (as reader), while at the same time reciting for his audience! Although it is certainly impossible to write a text which can only be performed or only read by a solitary reader, there are ways to make works either more or less suitable for particular uses. As we have seen, nothing in the *Satyrice* makes it averse to performance, while we have pointed to several features that would make it

78). We also have a reference to some one telling some “history” or “fable” in the circus (D.Chr. or. 20.10, τὸν δὲ ἱστορίαν τινα ἢ μῦθον διηγούμενον), but this last instance may not have been more than casual entertainment.

¹⁷² Lucianus *Pseudol.* 7.

¹⁷³ Lucianus *Pseudol.* 25.

¹⁷⁴ See Dihle 1978, 54–55.

¹⁷⁵ For a discussion of the “aural” quality of early Greek novels and their intended “readership” as not only the educated reader, but also a semi-literate or illiterate “hearer”, see Hägg 1994.

highly suitable for a lively recitation, a sort of one-man act in the theater. The *Satyrica* shares some of the generic premises of theatrical texts, which—unless making fun of their own convention—do not allude to the fact that the words which are spoken on stage have been written previously, or at least composed and memorized, but seek to create the illusion that the dialogues on stage are conceived on the spur of the moment. In likening the *Satyrica* to theatrical literature, however, we should be careful to distinguish between regular plays, which feature many interacting *personae*, and Encolpius' one-man recital.

1.2.8 Actor & Auditores

Our conclusion makes it necessary to reconsider a pre-existing hypothesis about the *Satyrica* as performance literature which was offered by the historicist school of Petronian scholarship. The historicist school, however, did not base its hypothesis on a close reading of the *Satyrica*, but assumed on the basis of the historical context that Petronius must have written and recited the *Satyrica* for an intimate circle of friends at the court of the Roman emperor Nero. Now, we must ask whether our conclusion that the *Satyrica* was written for performance is perhaps a vindication of the historicist assumption.

The lively gesticulation which is implicit in the text of the *Satyrica*; the mimicry of the speech mannerisms of the un-schooled freedmen; and the mixed form of the discourse, which abruptly switches from one discursive type to another and forces the reciting voice to repeatedly change its rhythm and tone; all this makes it clear that performing the *Satyrica* is a very difficult task, if it is to be done properly, and probably would require the training of a professional actor. It may thus be argued that the *Satyrica* is unlikely to have ever been performed by the author.¹⁷⁶ Historically, in the early empire the writer himself or a professional *lector* was variously used to perform a text.¹⁷⁷ The practice of using *lectores* in aristocratic circles was common.¹⁷⁸ Incidentally, a *lector* of Pliny the younger was named Encolpius.¹⁷⁹ In Plu-

¹⁷⁶ Arrowsmith 1987, x f., also argued for a professional performer: "For unless I am badly mistaken, the *Satyricon* was clearly written [...] to be recited aloud by a trained artist with a voice and virtuosity capable of registering the enormous variety of the work."

¹⁷⁷ Starr 1991, 337f.

¹⁷⁸ Starr 1991, 338.

¹⁷⁹ Plin. *Ep.* 8.1.

tarch's *Table-Talk*, a Stoic sophist describes a form of entertainment according to him recently brought in at parties in Rome:

“ἴστε γάρ,” εἶπεν, “ὅτι τῶν Πλάτωνος διαλόγων διηγηματικοί τινές εἰσιν οἱ δὲ δραματικοί· τούτων οὖν τῶν δραματικῶν τοὺς ἐλαφροτάτους ἐκδιδάσκονται παῖδες ὥστ’ ἀπὸ στόματος λέγειν· πρόσεστι δ’ ὑπόκρισις πρέπουσα τῷ ἥθει τῶν ὑποκειμένων προσώπων καὶ φωνῆς πλάσμα καὶ σχῆμα καὶ διαθέσεις ἐπόμεναι τοῖς λεγομένοις ...”

“You are aware,” he said, “that of the dialogues of Plato, some are narrative and others dramatic. Slaves are taught the liveliest of these dramatic dialogues, so as to recite them from the mouth. They use a type of presentation appropriate to the personalities of the characters in the text, with modulation of voice and gestures and delivery suited to the meaning ...”

Nothing stops a livelier narrative than Plato's philosophical narratives—we note the careful distinction between the basic forms of narrative (monologue) and drama (dialogue) in the passage—such as the *Satyrica* from being recited by a single slave.¹⁸⁰ The enjoyment of the performance of the *Satyrica* would naturally increase considerably from using a *lector* with the looks and qualities of Encolpius to act the narrator as he skillfully rides through his variegated narrative as a desultory horseman jumps between horses.

The merit of the Neronian performance hypothesis is that it (unconsciously?) recognizes that the *Satyrica* is performance literature. Since we have made up our minds to identify Petronius Arbiter as the consular friend of Nero, it is conceivable that, like Nero, the author of the *Satyrica* may have had ambitions as an actor. Besides, ancient rhetorical training, which the author of the *Satyrica* obviously underwent, especially the training in delivery, was easily and consistently confused with acting. Hence, Petronius might have performed the work himself in the person of Encolpius. However, this historical possibility—for it is no more than that—if explored, merely lands us in a situation similar to the one discussed in section 1.1 in relation to the Suetonian anecdote about Nero playing Hercules, and the reaction of the simple-minded young recruit: if we recognize the speaker as Petronius, we rupture the fabric of the story of Encolpius. The identity of

¹⁸⁰ Ancient recitals of literary texts were certainly not as formal as the modern academic lecture or readings of fiction or poetry by authors themselves. Jones 1991, 193, traces to Friedländer the incorrect view often expressed in commentaries and handbooks that private literary performances included only excerpts, or recitals by a single author.

Petronius Arbiter, whoever he was, cannot be accommodated in the travelogue and erotic recollections of Encolpius. In other words, it ultimately makes no difference to us whether it was Petronius who recited the *Satyrica* or an actor, because unlike the author of the *Apocolocyntosis*, who speaks in his own voice,¹⁸¹ Petronius would not have been identifiable as such while acting the *persona* of Encolpius. The fact is that no knowledge of the first historical performance is available, and the less we assume about this matter the less likely it is that we inadvertently confuse the personal attributes of Encolpius with those of the Neronian consular Petronius, a confusion with which we are all too familiar in the scholarship. The answer to the question that I posed above is therefore purely formal: The performance model does not imply any particular first performance context, and so does not validate or invalidate the hypothesis that Petronius wrote and recited the *Satyrica* for Nero. From a theoretical point of view the audience of performative literature is as undetermined as are the actors, since by design the work is “repeatable” and can be performed again at least as long as it retains the power to please audiences.¹⁸² The importance of the first historical performance of the *Satyrica* has therefore been greatly exaggerated.

It is far more fruitful to pay attention to the audience whom Encolpius pretends to be talking to in the text of the *Satyrica*. Who are his implied listeners? Nothing in the text indicates that they are a particular audience; rather it is relatively easy to show that his intended audience is a highly generic one. As the voice of Encolpius is scripted in the text, so is an imaginary “you”, the so-called Ideal Second Person. Whenever Encolpius evokes this imaginary other (7.4, 22.5, 23.5, 31.7, 36.6, 83.2, 127.5, 136.13), he is trying to establish a community of opinion between himself and his projected audience.¹⁸³ If we can make explicit this implicit presence of the act of narrating the *Satyrica* we can establish the audience on the grounds of the words of the only reliable witness to this scripted setting, Encolpius himself. By collect-

¹⁸¹ It is not an implausible interpretation of Dio Cassius’ (60.35.3) mention of the *Apocolocyntosis* that Seneca recited it to Nero, Agrippina, and his brother Lucius Junius Gallio about the time of Claudius’ funeral.

¹⁸² Vogt-Spira 1990, 183–90, discusses historical performances of the work, both in antiquity and among nineteenth-century German philologists. Cocchia 1893, 455, describes the production of the *Cena* at the Court of Hannover in 1702 with members of the royal family participating as actors.

¹⁸³ This indefinite imaginary person takes a subjunctive where usually a definite person would have an indicative. The singular is conventional and should not be taken literally (it was used in public speeches, e.g., Liv. 31.7.11).

ing and studying the most significant of these references we can form a rough idea of what kind of audience the narrator is constructing as he speaks.

At one point he tells us that while hurrying after Ascyrtos to the rooming-house he got lost in the Greek city and ran in circles until, exhausted and bathed in sweat, he approached an old street vendor whom he somewhat idiotically asked, *mater, numquid scis ubi ego habitem*—“mother, you wouldn’t happen to know where I’m lodged?” (7.1). To his surprise this *anus urbana* responded that she did, but then led him straight to a whore house and said *hic debes habitare*—“here is where you should live” (7.2). Unexpectedly, he says, he found Ascyrtos there in the *lupanar* in a similar state of exhaustion and adds, *putares ab eadem anicula esse deductum*—“you would have thought that the same little old woman had led him there” (7.4). As the narrative progresses Encolpius will soon tell of how he called Ascyrtos to his face *muliebris patientiae scortum, cuius ne spiritus purus est*—“you whore, submissive as a woman, whose breath is not even clean” (9.6). The implicit audience has already been told everything about how Ascyrtos submitted to Encolpius’ sexual advances in “the garden” (9.10, *viridarium*). For Encolpius to assume, then, that his audience would have given the penniless prostitute, Ascyrtos, the benefit of the doubt regarding his motives for being in the *lupanar*—unlike the *anicula* and the *pater familias*, who took Ascyrtos straight to the brothel to have sex with him (8.2–4), both having assumed exactly the contrary about the boys—is to assume a well-bred innocence in the audience, somewhat like that of the young man in the passage from the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* quoted above. We may therefore conclude that Encolpius’ ideal audience is trustful and presumably lacks insight into the machinations of rascals and swindlers such as Ascyrtos.

Again, in relating his discovery that Trimalchio’s slaves all sang while serving at table, Encolpius adds *pantomimi chorum, non patris familiae triclinium crederes*—“you would have thought that it was a chorus of a pantomime, and not the dining-room of a father of a household” (31.7). The audience of Encolpius is so thoroughly familiar with the protocol of behavior in Roman *triclinia*, and so unused to a household like the one of Trimalchio, that they would not recognize it as such, but think instead that Encolpius was describing a public theater. The same assumption underlies Encolpius’ next appeal to the imaginary other in regard to a slave who served food at the party, *processit statim scissor et ad symphoniam gesticulatus ita laceravit obsonium, ut putares essedarium hydraule cantante pugnare*—“forth came a carver and moved so perfectly in tune with the music that you would have thought he was a charioteer fighting in the arena to the sound of the water-

organ” (36.6).¹⁸⁴ In the mind of Encolpius’ ideal addressees there is a sense of *decorum* that draws a strict line between what is appropriate behavior in a respectable Roman domestic setting and what is acceptable only as public entertainment. His audience is not ideally in favor of confusing these two contexts.

Encolpius’ generic audience is not just morally superior but can also be relied on to appreciate illusive naturalism in painting and is familiar with the best known masters of this old and lost Greek art:¹⁸⁵ The fifth-century Zeuxis of the Attic school, who was said to have painted a boy holding grapes so realistic that birds flew to peck at them, which didn’t please him, however, for he said the boy should have been life-like enough to scare the birds away (Plin. *Nat.* 35.66); Protogenes, a contemporary of Aristotle and a friend of Apelles, who covered his painting of the Rhodian hero Ialysus with four layers of paint so as to give it a longer life and included a life-like dog whose highly convincing exhalation he was said to have finally made perfectly natural when in frustration and after many tries with the brush he chanced on the right effect with his sponge while removing paint (Plin. *Nat.* 35.102–3);¹⁸⁶ Apelles, the most celebrated of all Greek painters, whom Alexander the Great, through an edict, made his sole portrait painter; famous for his invisibly fine lines, he could paint horses so life-like that they were neighed at by the real animal (Plin. *Nat.* 35.95). It is in expressing his adoration for a painting of Apelles, titled Monocnemon (“The Single-Greaved”), that Encolpius adds, *tanta enim subtilitate extremitates imaginum erant ad similitudinem praecisae, ut crederes etiam animorum esse picturam*—“for the outlines of the images were cut with such finesse, that you would even have thought that the painting was endowed with the force of life” (83.2).¹⁸⁷

¹⁸⁴ Cf. also 60.1, where Encolpius calls *tam elegantes strophas* the antics of a food carver who mimics the madness of Ajax slaughtering the cattle.

¹⁸⁵ 88.1, *consulere prudentiorem coepi aetates tabularum ... simulque causam desidiae praesentis excutere, cum pulcherrimae artes perissent, inter quas pictura ne minimum quidem sui vestigium reliquisset* (“I began to consult the better informed man about the age of the pictures ... and at the same time to inquire into the reason for our present decadence, when the most beautiful arts have died out”).

¹⁸⁶ Sextus Empiricus (*Ph.* 1.28) recounts a very similar anecdote involving, this time, Apelles’ frustration and accidental success with the representation in a painting of a horse’s foam.

¹⁸⁷ I take *animus* here to be the force of life, or that quality which distinguishes between the apparently similar dead effigies, including corpses, and actual living people. Cf. Trimalchio’s words, at Sat. 52.1, *et pueri mortui iacent sic ut vivere putes* (“and the boys are lying there dead so [well depicted] that you would think they were alive”). The joke is of course on Trimalchio, who doesn’t master the language of contemporary art criticism; his appeal to the ideal second person indicates that he is emulating the language of others.

Encolpius can safely assume in his ideal audience a knowledge of these the most celebrated of old Greek masters, since in the first century B.C.E. their works could especially be seen in the temples and squares of Rome. Fulvius Nobilior brought the Muses by Zeuxis to Rome. In the first century there was a Helen by him in the *Porticus Philippi*, and a Marsyas in the *Delubrum Concordiae* (Plin. *Nat.* 35.66). At the same time Protogenes' Ialysus was found in the *Templum Pacis* (Plin. *Nat.* 35.102). Pliny thinks that a famous painting by both Protogenes and Apelles with lines almost invisible to the eye was destroyed by fire in the imperial palace on the Palatine. Augustus dedicated Apelles' Venus Anadyomene in the *Delubrum Caesaris*. When it deteriorated with age, nobody could repair it, and Nero had it replaced with a painting by Dorotheus. Augustus also dedicated two paintings of Alexander the Great (one of which had the king triumphantly riding in a chariot and the image of War with hands tied behind its back) in a prominent location in his *Forum Augusti*. Later, Claudius had Alexander's face cut out and replaced by the image of Augustus.

The ideal audience of the *Satyrica* exists in the margin of the historical context of which the *Naturalis Historia* forms a part. The encyclopedia of Pliny (23–79 C.E.) is appropriately generic, like the rhetorical treatises we have used above, to provide supplementation for the cultural context projected by Encolpius. Zeuxis, Protogenes and Apelles are properly characters in the historical context, although they are known to the fictional world of the *Satyrica*. The conservative Roman taste for these ancient masters likewise forms a part of the historico-cultural context of first-century Rome. In this case we are therefore directed by Encolpius himself towards the crossing of the boundary between fiction and history. The simple fact that the Greek Encolpius addresses his audience in Latin also shows that his generic audience is not a universal one, but strictly Roman, and either upper-class or at least subscribing to the value-system of the nobler families. On the whole the implied audience is supposed to be familiar with literature of all genres—especially literature in Latin, which further shows this to be a specifically Roman audience—and able to discriminate between good and bad examples.

One important feature of Encolpius' audience is the fact that they are supposed to be well versed in the Homeric tale of the wandering Odysseus. Unlike Trimalchio, they can be relied on to receive correctly esoteric and parodic allusions to this fundamental work of Greco-Roman literature. In the humorous *anagnorismos* scene on the ship, Lichas recognizes Encolpius by his genitals alone and addresses them, not the man, with the words *Salve*

Encolpi.¹⁸⁸ Immediately afterwards the narrator adds this philological observation: *miretur nunc aliquis Ulixis nutricem post vicesimum annum cicatricem invenisse originis indicem, cum homo prudentissimus confusis omnibus corporis indiciorumque lineamentis ad unicum fugitivi argumentum tam docte pervenerit*—“let no one be surprised any more that Odysseus’ nurse discovered the scar which revealed his identity after twenty years, when a clever man hit upon the one test of a runaway so brilliantly, though every feature of his face and body was blurred” (105.10). The name of Encolpius, which could be rendered into English as Mr. Incrotch (κόλπος means ‘bosom’, ‘crotch’, ‘fold of garment’; Enkolpios therefore means ‘he who is in the κόλπος’),¹⁸⁹ appears to be a significant mark of his identity, and the narrator of the *Satyrica* is therefore, in some sense, a speaking phallus, or, in more pedestrian language, a talking prick. His audience, however, who are expected to know enough Greek to understand the implications of the name, is no less respectable for that.

Another Homeric allusion comes in the narrative of his infatuation with the young Crotoniate beauty significantly named Circe. At the time, Encolpius says he hid under the name of Polyænos, an epithet of Odysseus, and had fallen head over heels in love with a prosaic version of the famous enchantress, as if following in the footsteps of the epic hero. After having impersonated the person of Circe speaking, Encolpius adds in his own voice, *haec ipsa cum diceret, tanta gratia conciliabat vocem loquentis, tam dulcis sonus pertemptatum mulcebat aëra, ut putares inter auras canere Sirenum concordiam*—“even as this woman spoke grace made her words so attractive, the sweet noise fell so softly upon the listening air, that you would have thought that the symphony of the Sirens was ringing in the breeze” (127.5).¹⁹⁰ We note that the paintings adored by Encolpius—which all had a similar motif: an older lover abducting or chasing after a young boy, who is the object of desire—were assumed to be adorable to his audience as well. And here this same audience is assumed to be susceptible to seduction by a fabulously beautiful young woman. The audience is accordingly allowed what seem to have been considered “normal” desires in ancient gentlemen for boys as well as pretty young women.¹⁹¹

¹⁸⁸ The passage makes one wonder what gestures would have accompanied this part of the narration.

¹⁸⁹ Walsh 1970, 81. On the name, see Maass 1925, 447. Martial uses a similar name, Encolpos, for a boy slave, the sexual partner of his master (1.31; 5.48).

¹⁹⁰ The narrator/performer can thus retrospectively be seen as setting a high standard for his own delivery of 127.1–2 and 4—and prospectively for 127.6–7.

¹⁹¹ Cf. *Sat.* 127.1–2, *Mox digitis gubernantibus vocem “si non fastidis” inquit* [sc. Circe]

What can we make of these explicit references to characters from the *Odyssey*, and the fact that Encolpius is on more than one occasion associated directly with Odysseus, who has been called “the very first explorer-narrator in the literary record”?¹⁹² To an audience assumed to be so familiar with the text of Homer and the whole tradition derived from the Homeric poem, a travelogue and narrative of erotic intrigues told by an unreliable but entertaining vagabond would present itself as a Phaeacian tale, a type of story so called after the yarn spun by Odysseus at the court of the noble if gullible king Alkinous.¹⁹³ In the following part we shall adopt this ubiquitous cultural model (I make no specific claims that the *Satyrica* is a parody of epic or indeed has any direct intertextual relationship with the *Odyssey*) as the working hypothesis in our reconstruction of the central fable of the *Satyrica*, which is the story told by Encolpius to his audience of old-fashioned Romans.

“feminam ornatam et hoc primum anno virum expertam, concilio tibi, o iuuenis, sororem. habes tu quidem et fratrem, neque enim me piguit inquirere, sed quid prohibet et sororem adoptare?” (“She let her fingers guide her words and said: ‘Young man, if you do not dislike a rich woman who has this year known her first man, I shall give you a sister. True, you have also a brother, for I made bold to inquire, but what stops you from adopting a sister too?’”)

¹⁹² Romm 1992, 183.

¹⁹³ The ancestry of this type of literary fabrication is obvious, e.g., to Juvenal (15.16) and Lucian (*VH* 1.2).

Part 2

Story

2.1 Sorting the Fragments

2.1.1 The Logic of the Story

The coherence of the plot can be assumed to be the most important quality of the *Satyrice*, if it is to be read as an extended fictional narrative. Because of the limited interest shown lately by scholars in this larger aspect of the work, little consensus exists as to what was told by Encolpius in the lost early part of the story. In my view, the work as we have it cannot well be read without some idea about the earlier context. Throughout the extant text and in the fragments are scattered references to the lost earlier parts, which need to be elucidated, and not just explained away as meaningless embellishments of language. Anyone who has faced the frustration of students who approach this work for the first time would agree. Not so long ago an American professor teaching a course on the Ancient Novel reported the following experience to *The Petronian Society Newsletter*: “A discovery particularly distressing [...] is that my students found Petronius to be the hardest text to deal with, not because of its matter (though quite a few were rather surprised by what they found) but because of its fragmentary nature and its generic peculiarities.”¹⁹⁴ It is therefore clearly not mere pedantry to resuscitate the seemingly dead debate on the reconstruction of the *Satyrice*'s plot. It seems, indeed, from the above that we have little to lose, in terms of readability, if we endeavor to alter the current perception of the work as isolated episodes and loose fragments to that of a more coherent fictional narrative.

2.1.2 The Erotic Travelogue

Let us begin then. There is good evidence (I shall discuss it below) in the fragments to locate the origin of the story and Encolpius' home city in Mas-salia. Our hero is a young man and typically needs to leave his hometown in order for his adventures to commence. Such is the invariable beginning of ancient fictions that involve the adventure stories of young people and teenagers. Ninos must leave his home and “traverse so much land” (*Fr.* A.II) and

¹⁹⁴ Relihan 1992, 8.

prove himself as king and leader of armies before he can propose to young Semiramis. According to Thomas Hägg's reconstruction of the lost *Metiochus and Parthenope*,¹⁹⁵ Metiochus leaves the Chersonese and arrives in Samos where Parthenope is the daughter of the tyrant Polycrates. From there on the story becomes an adventure story with wandering, separation and eventual reunion. In Chariton, Chaereas and Callirhoë first meet at the public festival of Aphrodite and then get married. Soon after he kicks her out of jealousy and apparently kills her. The plot starts like a squalid story of domestic violence, but the adventure first begins when she, still alive in her tomb, is removed by tomb-robbers and taken on a pirate ship away from Syracuse. The *Wonders beyond Thule* also opened with Dinias wandering from his Arcadian homeland in search of information. In Iamblichus' *Babyloniaca*, Sinon and Rhodanes must flee Babylon to escape from the men of King Garmus, who has fallen in love with Sinon. In Xenophon, Habrocomes and Anthia meet at the local festival of Artemis and fall desperately in love. Despite a gloomy oracle they are married and sent abroad on a ship, which is later captured by Phoenician pirates. In Achilles Tatius, Clitophon is betrothed to Calligone and would have married her had she not been kidnapped, and had he not met Leucippe and eloped with her from Tyre to Beirut, where they went on board a ship that soon after was wrecked in a storm. Daphnis and Chloe, although they never leave Lesbos, are exposed by their parents from Mytilene, and their adventures involve his kidnapping by pirates and her kidnapping by the Methymnian fleet. Heliodorus' *Aethiopica* tells, in its own elaborate manner, the story of Theagenes, a young Theban, and Charikleia, apparently a Delphian maiden, who meet at the Pythian games in her adopted home-city and fall in love. They decide to flee by sea, but not unpredictably fall into the hands of pirates. Even the Greek Ass-Story begins with Loukios having just left his hometown Patrai for Thessaly on business for his father. Lucian's parodic *Vera historia*, likewise, begins when the hero has set out one day from the Pillars of Hercules, i.e., he has left the *oikoumene* or the inhabited world. Alexander, of course, must leave Pella so that his bloody adventures in the world can earn him the epithet "Great". Apollonius king of Tyre also leaves Tyre and Antioch, and after he has married the daughter of the king of Cyrene, they travel by sea and she gives birth to a daughter and "dies" and he travels in distant parts before the family is reunited and goes back home.

It is therefore not surprising that Encolpius, too, must leave his home city. As we have seen, the protagonists of ancient fiction leave their home

¹⁹⁵ Hägg 1984, 1985.

for various reasons: for love, power and knowledge. Encolpius falls into the first category, but his love is not for a girl, but for a boy. Does this make any difference? Scholars sometimes assume, apparently following the German philologist Richard Heinze (1899), that as a “homosexual” love story the *Satyrica* is unique in ancient literature and must somehow be parodying the “heterosexual” so-called Ideal Greek Romances. The evidence does not warrant this assumption. A similar plot to that of the *Satyrica*, involving two young men as the loving couple, is found in the brief narrative of Hippothous to Habrocomes in the *Ephesiaca* (3.1–2). It is worth quoting in full, because, as we shall see, it adheres to an established narrative paradigm, which it has in common with the *Satyrica*. As a “comparison text” this one offers the closest available parallel with respect to the identities of the protagonists and the figures of the plot. We should especially pay attention to the highly generic circumstances and manner of introducing the narration of this “novel within the novel”:

Καὶ δὴ εὐωχουμένων αὐτῶν ἐστέναξεν ὁ Ἰππόθοος καὶ ἐπεδάκρυσεν· ὁ δὲ Ἀβροκόμης ἤρετο αὐτὸν τίς ἢ αἰτία τῶν δακρῶν. Καὶ ὁς “μεγάλα” ἔφη “τάμὰ διηγήματα καὶ πολλὴν ἔχοντα τραγωδίαν”. Ἐδέετο Ἀβροκόμης εἰπεῖν, ὑπισχνούμενος καὶ τὰ καθ’ αὐτὸν διηγῆσασθαι. Ὁ δὲ ἀναλαβὼν ἄνωθεν (μόνοι δὲ ἐτύγχανον ὄντες) ἐξηγεῖται τὰ καθ’ αὐτόν.

“Ἐγὼ” ἔφη “εἰμὶ τὸ γένος πόλεως Περίνθου (πλησίον δὲ τῆς Θράκης ἢ πόλις) τῶν τὰ πρῶτα ἐκεῖ δυναμένων· ἀκούεις δὲ καὶ τὴν Πέρινθον ὡς ἔνδοξος, καὶ τοὺς ἄνδρας ὡς εὐδαίμονες ἐνταῦθα. Ἐκεῖ νέος ὢν ἠράσθην μειρακίου καλοῦ· ἦν δὲ τὸ μειράκιον τῶν ἐπιχωρίων· ὄνομα Ὑπεράνθης ἦν αὐτῷ. Ἡράσθην δὲ τὰ πρῶτα ἐν γυμνασίοις διαπαλαίοντα ἰδὼν καὶ οὐκ ἔκαρτέρησα. Ἐορτῆς ἀγομένης ἐπιχωρίου καὶ παννυχίδος ἐπ’ αὐτῆς πρόσειμι τῷ Ὑπεράνθῃ καὶ ἱκετεύω κατοικεῖται· ἀκούσαν δὲ τὸ μειράκιον πάντα ὑπισχνεῖται κατελεῆσάν με. Καὶ τὰ πρῶτά γε τοῦ ἔρωτος ὁδοιπορεῖ φιλήματα καὶ ψαύσματα καὶ πολλὰ παρ’ ἐμοῦ δάκρυα· τέλος δὲ ἠδυνήθημεν καιροῦ λαβόμενοι γενέσθαι μετ’ ἀλλήλων μόνοι καὶ τὸ τῆς ἡλικίας [ἀλλήλοισι] ἀνύποπτον ἦν. Καὶ χρόνῳ συνῆμεν πολλῶ, στέργοντες ἀλλήλους διαφερόντως, ἕως δαίμων τις ἡμῖν ἐνεμέσθη. Καὶ ἔρχεται τις ἀπὸ Βυζαντίου (πλησίον δὲ τὸ Βυζάντιον τῇ Περίνθῳ) ἀνὴρ τῶν τὰ πρῶτα ἐκεῖ δυναμένων, [ὁς] ἐπὶ πλούτῳ καὶ περιουσίᾳ μέγα φρονῶν· Ἀριστόμαχος ἐκαλεῖτο. Οὗτος ἐπιβὰς εὐθύς τῇ Περίνθῳ, ὡς ὑπὸ τινος ἀπεσταλμένος κατ’ ἐμοῦ θεοῦ, ὄρᾳ τὸν Ὑπεράνθην σὺν ἐμοὶ καὶ εὐθέως ἀλίσκεται, τοῦ μειρακίου θαυμάσας τὸ κάλλος, πάντα ὄντινον ἐπάγεσθαι δυνάμενον. Ἐρασθεῖς δὲ οὐκέτι μετρίως κατεῖχε τὸν ἔρωτα, ἀλλὰ τὰ μὲν πρῶτα τῷ μειρακίῳ προσέπεμπεν· ὡς δὲ ἀνήνυτον

ἦν αὐτῷ (ὁ γὰρ Ὑπεράνθης διὰ τὴν πρὸς ἐμὲ εὐνοίαν οὐδένα προσίετο), πείθει τὸν πατέρα αὐτοῦ, πονηρὸν ἄνδρα καὶ ἐλάττονα χρημάτων· ὁ δὲ αὐτῷ δίδωσι τὸν Ὑπεράνθην προφάσει διδασκαλίας· ἔλεγε γὰρ εἶναι λόγων τεχνίτης. Παραλαβὼν δὲ αὐτὸν τὰ μὲν πρῶτα κατάκλειστον εἶχε, μετὰ τοῦτο δὲ ἀπῆρεν ἐς Βυζάντιον. Εἰπόμην κἀγώ, πάντων καταφρονήσας τῶν ἐμαυτοῦ, καὶ ὅσα ἐδυνάμην συνήμην τῷ μεираκίῳ· ἐδυνάμην δὲ ὀλίγα, καὶ μοι φίλημα σπάνιον ἐγένετο καὶ λαλιὰ δυσχερῆς· ἐφρουρούμην δὲ ὑπὸ πολλῶν. Τελευταῖον οὐκέτι καρτερῶν, ἐμαυτὸν παροξύνας ἐπάνειμι εἰς Πέρινθον καὶ πάντα ὅσα ἦν μοι κτήματα ἀποδόμενος, συλλέξας ἄργυρον εἰς Βυζάντιον ἔρχομαι καὶ λαβὼν ξιφίδιον (συνδοκοῦν τοῦτο καὶ τῷ Ὑπεράνθῃ) εἴσειμι νύκτωρ εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν τοῦ Ἀριστομάχου καὶ εὐρίσκω συγκατακείμενον τῷ παιδί καὶ ὀργῆς πλησθεὶς παῖω τὸν Ἀριστόμαχον καιρίαν. Ἡσυχίας δὲ οὔσης καὶ πάντων ἀναπαυομένων ἔξειμι ὡς εἶχον λαθόν, ἐπαγόμενος καὶ τὸν Ὑπεράνθην, καὶ δι' ὅλης νυκτὸς ὀδεύσας εἰς Πέρινθον, εὐθὺς νεῶς ἐπιβάς οὐδενὸς εἰδότης ἔπλεον εἰς Ἀσίαν. Καὶ μέχρι μὲν τινος διήνυστο εὐτυχῶς ὁ πλοῦς· τελευταῖον δὲ κατὰ Λέσβον ἡμῖν γενομένοις ἐμπίπτει πνεῦμα σφοδρὸν καὶ ἀνατρέπει τὴν ναῦν. Κἀγώ μὲν τῷ Ὑπεράνθῃ συννηχόμην ὑπῶν αὐτῷ καὶ κουφοτέραν τὴν νῆξιν ἐποιοῦμην· νυκτὸς δὲ γενομένης οὐκέτι ἐνεγκὸν τὸ μεираκίον παρείθη τῷ κολύμβῳ καὶ ἀποθνήσκει. Ἐγὼ δὲ τοσοῦτον ἠδυνήθην τὸ σῶμα διασῶσαι ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν καὶ θάψαι· καὶ πολλὰ δακρύσας καὶ στενάξας, ἀφελὼν λείψανα καὶ δυνηθεὶς εὐπορήσαι πού ἐνός ἐπιτηδείου λίθου στήλην ἐπέστησα τῷ τάφῳ καὶ ἐπέγραψα εἰς μνήμην τοῦ δυστυχοῦς μεираκίου ἐπίγραμμα παρ' αὐτὸν ἐκεῖνον τὸν καιρὸν πλασάμενος·

Ἰππόθοος κλεινῷ τεύξεν τόδε <σήμ'> Ὑπεράνθῃ,
οὐ τάφον ἐκ θανάτου ἀγαθὸν ἱεροῖο πολίτου·
ἐς βάθος ἐκ γαίης, ἄνθος κλυτόν, ὃν ποτε δαίμων
ἤρπασεν ἐν πελάγει μεγάλου πνεύσαντος ἀήτου.

Τοῦντεῦθεν δὲ εἰς μὲν Πέρινθον ἐλθεῖν οὐ διέγων, ἐτράπην δὲ δι' Ἀσίας ἐπὶ Φρυγίαν τὴν μεγάλην καὶ Παμφυλίαν· κἀνταῦθα ἀπορία βίου καὶ ἀθυμία τῆς συμφορᾶς ἐπέδωκα ἐμαυτὸν ληστηρίῳ. Καὶ τὰ μὲν πρῶτα ὑπηρετῆς ληστηρίου γενόμενος, τὸ τελευταῖον [δὲ] περὶ Κιλικίαν αὐτὸς συνεστησάμην ληστήριον, εὐδοκίμησαν ἐπὶ πολὺ, ἕως ἐλήφθησαν οἱ σὺν ἐμοὶ οὐ πρὸ πολλοῦ τοῦ σε ἰδεῖν. Αὕτη μὲν ἡ τῶν ἐμῶν διηγημάτων τύχη· σὺ δέ, ὦ φίλτατε, εἰπέ μοι τὰ ἑαυτοῦ· δηλὸς γὰρ εἶ μεγάλη τινὶ ἀνάγκῃ τῇ κατὰ τὴν πλάνην χρώμενος.”

And it was as they were carousing that Hippothous let out a moan and began to weep. Habrocomes asked him why he was weeping. “It’s a long

story,” he replied, “and a very tragic one.” Habrocomes asked him to tell it and promised to tell his own as well. As they were alone, Hippothous told his story from the beginning.

“I belong,” he said, “to one of the leading families of Perinthus, a city close to Thrace. And as you are aware, Perinthus is an important city and its citizens are well to do. There while I was a young man I fell in love with a beautiful youth, also from Perinthus, called Hyperanthes. I first fell in love with him when I saw his wrestling exploits in the gymnasium and I could not contain myself; during a local festival with an all-night vigil I approached Hyperanthes and begged him to take pity on me. He listened to me, took pity on me, and promised me everything. And our first steps in lovemaking were kisses and caresses, while I shed floods of tears. And at last we were able to take our opportunity to be alone with each other; we were both the same age, and no one was suspicious. For a long time we were together passionately in love, until some evil spirit envied us. One of the leading men in Byzantium (the neighboring city) arrived in Perinthus: this was Aristomachus, a man proud of his wealth and prosperity. The moment he set foot in the town, as if sent against me by some god, he set eyes on Hyperanthes with me and was immediately captivated, amazed at the boy’s beauty, which was capable of attracting anyone. When he had fallen in love, he could no longer restrain himself but first made overtures to the young man; when that brought no result (for Hyperanthes would let no one near him because of his relationship with me), he won over the boy’s father, a villainous man subservient to money. And he made over Hyperanthes to Aristomachus on the pretext of private tuition, for he claimed to be a teacher of rhetoric. When he first took the boy over, he kept him under lock and key, and then took him off to Byzantium. I followed, ignoring all my own affairs, and kept him company as often as I could; but that was seldom, there were few kisses, and he was difficult to talk to: too many were watching me. At length I could hold out no longer. Nerving myself, I went back to Perinthus, sold everything I had, got my money together, and went to Byzantium; I took a sword (Hyperanthes had agreed to this as well), made my way into Aristomachus’ house during the night, and found him lying in bed with the boy. I was enraged and struck him a fatal blow. All was quiet, and everyone asleep: I left secretly with Hyperanthes without further ado; traveling all through the night to Perinthus, I at once embarked on a ship for Asia, unknown to anyone. And for a while the voyage went well. But a heavy storm struck us off Lesbos and capsized the ship. I swam alongside Hyperanthes, gave him support, and made it eas-

ier for him to swim. But night came on, and the boy could not hold on any longer, gave up his efforts to swim, and died. I was only able to rescue his body, bring it to land, and bury it. I wept and wailed profusely and removed the relics. I could only provide a single stone to serve as a memorial on the grave, and inscribed it in memory of the unfortunate youth with a makeshift epigram.

Hippothous fashioned this tomb for far-famed Hyperanthes,
A tomb unworthy of the death of a sacred citizen,
The famous flower an evil spirit once snatched
from the land into the deep,

On the ocean he snatched him as a great storm wind blew.

After this I decided not to return to Perinthus but made my way through Asia to Phrygia Magna and Pamphylia. And there, since I had no means of supporting myself and was distressed at the tragedy, I took to brigandage. At first I was only one of the rank and file but in the end I got together a band of my own in Cilicia; it was famed far and wide, until it was captured not long before I saw you. This, then, is the misfortune I am telling you about. But you, Habrocomes, my dearest man, tell me your own story, for I am sure that there was some great necessity that forced you to become a wanderer.”¹⁹⁶

A stranger’s narrative to a stranger, this story is only told after a specific request and a promise to reciprocate with another story. As Glenn Most has argued persuasively, a stranger’s personal recollection of his woes in the Greek narrative tradition is typically not offered voluntarily, but is, as it were, “wrung from his lips by a moment of overwhelming compulsion.”¹⁹⁷ Such a moment is implicit for the narrative setting of the *Satyricon* as well and explains the often painful, or at least embarrassed feelings experienced by Encolpius at the recital of the story to his audience of good Romans. The typical symptoms of the very storied life of Hippothous are his Odyssean tears and wailing which directly prompt the request for his telling his life’s tale.¹⁹⁸ The circumstances of Odysseus’ telling his tale of woe are so often invoked by later narratives that they cannot count as specific reference, but should rather be taken as a generic marker.¹⁹⁹ The same narrative paradigm

¹⁹⁶ The translation is based on that of Anderson, in Reardon 1989, 147–8.

¹⁹⁷ Most 1989, 127.

¹⁹⁸ Alkinous, having observed the guest’s misery, says: εἰπέ δ’ ὅ τι κλαίεις καὶ ὀδύρεαι ἔνδοθι θυμῷ ... —“tell (me) why you weep and lament in your heart ...” (*Od.* 8.577), and in response to the request Odysseus tells his story.

¹⁹⁹ Similar situations with explicit or implicit references to the Homeric paradigm occur, e.g.,

is used in *Sat.* 61.1–6, when Trimalchio asks Niceros, who has remained silent during the party, to tell a story, and he agrees after some apologies, while the narrator describes his beginning with phrases reminiscent of Aeneas' narrative at the Carthaginian court, which is of course directly modeled on the Odyssean paradigm.²⁰⁰

The tone and mood of the story of Hippothous show that it was quite possible to tell a romantic adventure story of two boys including envious divinities; cruel competitors who pose as educators; fathers who are described as “subservient to money” (cf. *Sat.* 84.3, *infra pecuniam*); jealousy, murder, travel, shipwreck, piracy and brigandage, without the “homosexuality” of the romantic couple in any way undermining the seriousness (if that is the proper term) that we are familiar with in the “heterosexual” so-called Ideal Greek Romances. These stories about young men and their often violent and lawless love affairs are at least as old as Thucydides.²⁰¹ A frequent item in the plot is the killing of an older and more powerful competitor; they also often involve embarking on a career of brigandage and piracy, which includes living in bands of desperate young men who are outlaws from normal society. This may have some relation to the sometimes initiatory nature of ancient pederasty, and its relation with military camaraderie.²⁰²

Interestingly, Hippothous is a role-player, just like Encolpius; one day he is a pirate, the next he and his company “pose as tourists” (X.Eph. 4.1). Role-playing in the *Satyrica* is a function of outlawry and the life-style of vagabonds, for the marginal condition of vagabonds and drifters does not allow them to speak frankly or claim their right among strangers directly.²⁰³ The many lies and deceptions of Odysseus in the last twelve books of the

in Pl. *R.* 614b; Verg. *Aen.* 2.3; Chariton 4.3; X.Eph. 5.1; Juv. 15.16; Ps.-Lucianus *Onos* 1; Apul. *Met.* 1.1–2; Lucianus *VH* 1.3, *Merc. Cond.* 1; Ach. *Tat.* 1.2, 2.34, 7.3–4; Longus 2.3; Hld. 1.8 and 2.21. For references to “first-person narratives” told to strangers in tragedy and comedy, see Most 1989, 120–121. For a discussion of the Odyssean “Ich-Erzählung” with respect to narrative technique in the ancient novel, see Suerbaum 1968.

²⁰⁰ 61.5, *haec ubi dicta dedit, talem fabulam exorsus est* (“These were the words he uttered; then he embarked upon this tale”). The words *haec ubi dicta dedit* are a Virgilian formula (Verg. *A.* 2.790, 6.628, 7.323 and 471, 8.541, 10.633, 12.81 and 441), also used by Eumolpus in his poem on the civil war, *Sat.* 121.1 v. 100.

²⁰¹ See Thucydides (6.54), who relates a story from Athenian history; Parthenios (Parth. 7) who preserves a late fourth, early third-century B.C.E. account by Phantias of Eresos; see also Parth. 24; Ach. *Tat.* 1.7–14, 2.34; and two of five short narratives in Plutarch's *Love stories (Moralia 772d–774d)*.

²⁰² See Sergent 1986, 40–54. See also the classic formulation of “the black hunter” / ephebe complex in Vidal-Naquet 1986.

²⁰³ Consider Ascyrtos' words “Who in this place knows us, or who will take our words for anything” (*Sat.* 14.1, “*quis*” ... “*hoc loco nos novit aut quis habebit dicentibus fidem?*”).

Odyssey are the ultimate literary model for this tradition,²⁰⁴ as is signaled in the *Satyrica* by Encolpius' adopting as a pseudonym an epithet of the hero, *Polyaenos* (Πολύαινος),²⁰⁵ "much praised", during the deceiving *mimus* (117.4) invented by Eumolpus to trick the legacy hunters of Croton. The Homeric scholia include the following comment on Athena's strange praise of Odysseus' cunning lies to her: "Travelers abroad are forced to lie, since, being among foreigners, they are exposed to harm" (Schol. *Od.* 13.294).²⁰⁶ Odysseus is the archetypal liar in later Greco-Roman literature (Arist. *Po.* 1460a; Hor. *Ars* 151; Juv. 15.16; Lucian *VH* 1.2f.; Eust. *Comm. ad Od.* 14.199) and, in fact, he is universally admired, even in the Homeric poems themselves, for his rhetorical skill (*Il.* 3.204–224) and his guile and deceitful tales (*Od.* 13.287–310). His cunning verbal manipulations are generally successful, regardless of whether there is a grain of truth in them.

Just like Encolpius, Hippothous does not only chase after boys, he also becomes the object of women's desires (X.Eph. 5.9). We must be careful not to generalize about ancient sexual *personae* on the basis of our own modern assumptions, for there are clearly major differences between our categories and the ancient ones, as has been shown in recent studies.²⁰⁷ The apparent normality of the relationship of the boys should not come as a surprise either, for we have seen that the respectable audience of the *Satyrica* considers both boys and beautiful young women desirable as sexual partners and does not seem to rank one higher than the other. Neither does it make the least difference whether we are dealing with pederasty in a "Greek" or "Roman" literary work. This dichotomy in the scholarly literature is traditionally so steeped in nineteenth-century ideologies that it is best left completely out of the picture.²⁰⁸ Encolpius' "homosexuality", therefore, is not what makes the

²⁰⁴ See Trahman 1952, 34–42; Walcott 1977. For Athena, Odysseus assumes the role of a Cretan exile who has a family at home (*Od.* 13.256–286); for Eumaeus, he is a grateful beggar who originates again from Crete and is the son of a rich man and a concubine (*Od.* 14.199–359); for Antinous, his background is more condensed but similar, but the account of how he got to Ithaca has changed completely (*Od.* 17.415–444); for Penelope, he is Aethon brother of Idomeneus, friend of Odysseus (*Od.* 19.165–360); and finally to his father Laertius, he is Eperitus from Alybas (*Od.* 24.303–314).

²⁰⁵ *Od.* 12.184. The epithet is used by the Sirens, when they address Odysseus, in the famous episode when they try to lure him to wreck his ship (*Od.* 12.39–54; 158–200).

²⁰⁶ Cf. Eumaeus' words: "nay, at random, when they have need of entertainment, do vagabonds lie, and are not minded to speak the truth"—ἄλλ' ἄλλως, κομιδῆς κεκρημένοι, ἄνδρες ἀληταί / πρῆδοντ', οὐδ' ἐθέλουσιν ἀληθέα μυθήσασθαι (*Od.* 14.124–5).

²⁰⁷ For an excellent treatment of the complicated question of modern homosexuality and ancient pederasty, and the various structural paradigms of ancient sexual relationships, see Konstan 1994.

²⁰⁸ Encolpius is a Greek, and as I shall argue below, the *Satyrica* is most likely a Roman adap-

Satyrica a parody—if that is what it is—since the pederastic paradigm was open to many uses and variations. Nor is the tragic nature of the story of Hippothous, the death of the loved one, in any way determined by the gender of the couple.²⁰⁹ Facile critical dichotomies will merely pose obstacles to our understanding.

The supposed “homosexuality” of the protagonist was indeed not the main point of Richard Heinze’s thesis, that the *Satyrica* was a parody of the “Greek Ideal Romance.”²¹⁰ Heinze’s condemnation of Petronius for being at his most “shameless” when he expected his readers to accept Encolpius and Giton as a romantic couple (*Unter den vielen Frechheiten Petrons scheint mir die frechste die, das er uns zumuthet, als Liebespaar Encolpios und Giton uns gefallen zu lassen*) may have been no more than an obligatory nod to proper morals, although in recent scholarship the statement is at times assumed to have been the basis of his parody-thesis.²¹¹ The main achievement of Heinze’s thesis, in my view, is not to have shown that the *Satyrica* was a parody of the Greek erotic fictions, but in fact to have shown that the work is just that, an erotic fictional narrative with a structure and plot organization comparable to those of the fully extant works.

Heinze demonstrated by means of a close comparative reading of the *Satyrica* and the Greek fictions that there was a clear schematic analogy between the fortune and behavior of the couple in the fragmentary Latin text and the fully extant Greek erotic fictions. Encolpius and Giton get their fair share of wandering from place to place, and they even experience the generic storm at sea and shipwreck. Typically, their own beauty or desirability is their worst enemy, since this attracts many rivals who threaten the integrity of their bond. Such external threats, then, naturally lead to outbursts of jealousy, as well as instances of real betrayal, comparable to Clitophon’s and Daphnis’ infidelities, or in some degree to Callirhoë’s marriage to Dionysius. Heinze convincingly supported his sentimental reading of the work by reference to the frequent qualification in the text itself of the boys’ relationship as “a very old relationship”, *vetustissima consuetudo* (80.6), and conjec-

tation of a Greek model, which was just as prosimetric and comic as the Latin work. I shall discuss in general the modern “Roman” / “Greek” dichotomy in section 3.2.

²⁰⁹ For no less tragic love stories of male-female couples, see e.g. the story of Charite, Tlepolemus and Thrasyllus (Apul. *Met.* 8.1–14); see also Parthenios (4, 5, 9, 10, 14, 15, 19, 20, 21, 27, 28, 31, 32, 34, 35, 36); Plutarch, *Moralia* 771f–772c; 774e–775b.

²¹⁰ Heinze 1899.

²¹¹ See Bernd Effe 1987 for a criticism of the assumption that “homosexuality” in the *Satyrica* is a parody of the “heterosexuality” of the Greek erotic fictions. Clearly, no such parodic transformation was needed in the Greco-Roman world to give rise to a fictional love story of two boys.

tured that, unlike Ascyrtos and Eumolpus, Giton must have been introduced at the beginning of the work and followed Encolpius until the end.²¹² He also notes that Encolpius portrays himself as being very sentimental, and frequently bursting into tears over the adversity of fortune (24.1, 81.1, 91.4, 99.2, 113.9, 115.12, 134.5), much like the couples of the Greek works, and both he and Giton often claim to live only for their mutual love, and routinely turn suicidal at the prospect of losing each other (80.7, 94.8, 114.9–13, 127.4). Despite the supposedly outrageous “homosexuality” in the story, Heinze nevertheless recognized that serious erotic stories in Greek prose literature, featuring two males as the *Liebepaar*, certainly predate the *Satyrica*, and was fully aware that examples of this type are found in the Greek erotic novels themselves, such as the Hippothous story above.²¹³ He claimed, of course, that there were important generic differences between the Big Five extant erotic fictions and the *Satyrica*, but let us leave that problem until later, when we treat the comic narrative stance of Encolpius and his inferior moral status with respect to his audience (see section 3.1.5), and examine here the evidence for the beginning of Encolpius’ story.

2.1.3 Encolpius the Massaliot

Encolpius is certainly of Greek origin, although his audience is Roman and the extant text deals with episodes set in Italy, though mostly in Greek communities. The vast majority of characters in the extant story are Greek, and we can therefore with some justice say that the *Satyrica* is a Greek story, notwithstanding the language and the audience.²¹⁴ The evidence for the ancient and long independent Greek city of Massalia as Encolpius’ birthplace comes from two fourth and fifth-century fragments, which read side by side with a few passages of the *Satyrica* yield this information easily. Servius’ commentary (*Aen.* 3.57) provides the following description (*Fr.* I) culled from the full-text *Satyrica*:

²¹² He also cites 10.7, *iam dudum enim amoliri cupiebam custodem molestum, ut veterem cum Gitone meo rationem reducerem* (“I had been eager for some time to get rid of this annoying custodian, so that I could resume the old relationship with my Giton”); and indications that Ascyrtos is ignorant of, or pretends not to know about, Encolpius’ relationship with Giton (9.4–10, 11.3f.).

²¹³ Note, however, that Heinze 1899, 497 n. 3, qualifies his comparison by saying that this story and those of Clinias and Menelaus in Achilles Tatius figure “freilich nur episodisch”.

²¹⁴ At least three quarters of the proper names in the extant *Satyrica* are purely Greek; cf. *Index personarum* in Ernout 1962, 207–10.

auri sacra fames] *sacra* id est execrabilis. tractus est autem sermo ex more Gallorum. nam Massilienses quotiens pestilentia laborabant, unus se ex pauperibus offerebat alendus anno integro publicis et purioribus cibis. hic postea ornatus verbenis et vestibus sacris circumducebatur per totam civitatem cum execrationibus, ut in ipsum reciderent mala totius civitatis, et sic proiciebatur. hoc autem in Petronio lectum est.

accursed hunger for gold] *sacra* means accursed. This manner of speaking derives from a custom of the Gauls, for whenever the Massaliots suffered from a pestilence, one of the poor citizens offered himself to be fed for a whole year on public and pure food. This individual was then equipped with branches and dressed in sacred attire and led around the whole city with curses, so that on him would descend the evils of the whole city, and thus he was banished. This can be read in Petronius.

Servius is, unsuccessfully, attempting to explain the word *sacra* in Virgil by assuming that, since he was a Mantuan and therefore originally from Gallia Cisalpina, he used the word in a specifically Gallic sense. Hence the association with the Petronian passage which Servius takes to be reliable evidence for religious customs in the Greek city of Massalia (also in Gallia) in accordance with the grammarian's practice of extracting historical and biographical information from literary works. It is evident that Servius' Petronius was as much a Massaliot in custom and language as Virgil was a Mantuan.

It is of scant importance to us whether the information thus acquired is reliable.²¹⁵ What matters is that Servius read in Petronius that one of the poor citizens of Massalia, *unus ex pauperibus* [*sc. civibus*], had volunteered to act the role of the "scapegoat" (φαρμακός) in return for being fed for a whole year at public expense, and was then expelled from the city when that time was up. As we learn from textbooks on Greek religion, the human scapegoat is sacrificed only in a social sense.²¹⁶ His treatment is reminiscent of that of a beast marked for sacrifice. The beating and cursing of the φαρμακός to ward

²¹⁵ Another commentary, that of Lactantius Placidus on Statius' *Thebais* (10.793–4), has sometimes been adduced as further evidence for the historical truth of this alleged Gallic custom, but as Paratore 1933, 1, 152, has shown, it is entirely derived from Servius' clause, using very similar language, and therefore offers no independent evidence. Lactantius Placidus mentions neither Massalia nor Petronius.

²¹⁶ Walsh 1970, 73 n.3, seems to mistake the meaning of *proiciebatur* and translates "pushed off a cliff." The verb could possibly carry the sense "to offer as a sacrifice", but this is doubtful (probably always a corruption of *porricio*; see *OLD* under '*proicio*' 3b and 7b.), whereas the sense "to drive out (a person)" or "to banish" (e.g., *proicere in exilium*) is well attested (Ovid, Silius Italicus, Tacitus, Apuleius and Seneca).

off sin, plague or famine was no doubt of importance in actual ancient ritual (e.g., the beating of boys in the ritual of Artemis Ortheia at Sparta), but the behavior of the human scapegoat was likely conventionalized and may have resembled that of a writhing dancer or an actor in comedy, such as the *stupidus* of mime.²¹⁷

A relevant ancient account of such a ritual survives in the poems of Hipponax (*Frs.* 5–11 [West]). In threatening his enemies with destruction Hipponax provides a description of how the *φαρμακός* should be dealt with: A deformed and repulsive male is selected and feasted on figs, barley broth, and cheese, then whipped with fig branches and sea onions, and struck seven times on his *membrum virile*. Walter Burkert explains how there is a moral condemnation implicit in the rejection of this supposedly depraved individual.²¹⁸

It is clearly essential that the creature to be driven out be first brought into intimate contact with the community, the city; this is the sense of the gifts of food which are constantly mentioned. Figs are doubly contrasted to normal culture, to the fruits of the field and to the flesh of the victim; they point to sweetness, luxury, licentiousness, a breath of a golden age from which reality must be rudely distinguished ...; the outcast is then called the one wiped off all around, *peripsema*. There is not active killing, but simply a matter of offscourings which must be thrown across the boundaries or over the cliffs, never to return.

It is easy to see how this episode would fit into the *Satyrical*'s plot. Encolpius, Ascylos or Eumolpus are just the types to recklessly exploit such a situation despite the consequences.²¹⁹ Constantly penniless and needy, they gladly take every opportunity that comes along to get food, money and sex. In the extant *Satyrical*, religious cults and rituals are generally represented as pretexts for sexual and financial exploitation, and we may accordingly imagine the tone and mood of the episode as anything but solemn. But most importantly, the possibility that the branches mentioned in the account of Servius have something to do with the beating of the scapegoat on his penis, and, in any case, the general prominence of Encolpius' phallus in the extant

²¹⁷ See Wylie 1994, 48–9.

²¹⁸ For Greek scapegoat rituals generally, see Burkert 1985, 82–84. The same source is also to be credited for the information about the *pharmakos* in Hipponax.

²¹⁹ 99.1, “*ego sic semper et ubique vixi, ut ultimam quamque lucem tamquam non redituram consumerem*” (“I have always and everywhere lived my life as if I was enjoying the last light and would never see another day”).

story, make him exceptionally well suited to play the *φαρμακός* in such a ritual. In the extant text of the *Satyrice* the shaving of Encolpius' and Giton's heads, which is then interpreted as sinister for the entire ship's company (103.5), might be cited as a parallel. The feeding and fattening of Encolpius is also an important part of the Croton episode,²²⁰ where there is likewise a sense of imminent danger which spoils the pleasure of temporary well-being (125.2–4).²²¹ Moreover, his humiliating procession through the streets of Massalia has a partial but striking resemblance to the *Risus*-festival in Apuleius (*Met.* 3.1–12), where Lucius is made the butt of the entire citizenry of Hypata.²²²

As we have seen above, a ritual or a religious festival is used in three of the five fully extant erotic fictions to get the plot going (Chariton, Xenophon, Heliodorus). In the Greek cultural context, so preoccupied with the preservation of civic cohesion, to be thus cursed or mocked by a whole city, especially one's own, is nothing short of a nightmare and certainly the ultimate in humiliation. Servius says he read about this humiliated Massalio in Petronius, and from the extant part of the *Satyrice* we know that, of the characters in the story, Encolpius himself is the most susceptible to humiliation.

Fragment IV, a few lines from a poetic eulogy of Sidonius Apollinaris (*Carm.* 28.145–7), also ties the *Satyrice* to Massalia:

145 quid vos eloquii canam Latini,
 Arpinas, Patavine, Mantuane,
 [...]
 155 et te Massiliensium per hortos
 sacri stipitis, Arbiter, colonum
 Hellespontiaco parem Priapo?

'why should I sing of you as sires of Latin eloquence,
 Arpinian, Patavinian, and Mantuan
 [...] and you, Arbiter, worshipper of the holy trunk,
 that is found throughout the gardens of Massalia,
 yourself on a par with Priapus of the Hellespont?'

²²⁰ 125.2, *quotidie magis magisque superfluentibus bonis saginatum corpus impleveram* ("each day I filled my stuffed body as the situation with material goods became more and more overabundant").

²²¹ 125.4, *nempe rursus fugiendum erit et tandem expugnata paupertas nova mendicitate revocanda* ("no doubt it will be necessary to flee again and our poverty, that had at long last been taken care of, will again call for a new life of begging").

²²² It may be added here in a footnote that Fellini incorporated the *Risus*-festival into his cinematographic version of the *Satyrice*, creating some quite memorable scenes.

The late fifth-century Christian bishop here apostrophizes three Roman literary worthies (Cicero, Livy and Virgil) by noting only their birthplaces (Arpinum, Patavium, Mantua). He goes on to address others and amongst them “Arbiter”, who is presented as being in Massalia, as if Petronius Arbiter, the author, were that character of the *Satyrice* whom Servius refers to in the first fragment.²²³

Birt rightly rejected Cichorius’ interpretation of the words *sacer stipes* in Sidonius’ poem as a hollow tree trunk wherein the statue of Priapus was placed,²²⁴ but he also rejected Bücheler’s interpretation, unnecessarily in my view, that the word referred to the wooden image of Priapus. For Birt *stipes* was the removable phallic stake (*Knüttel*), which was stuck into the *simulacrum* of Priapus and withdrawn by the *vilicus* to penetrate the behind of thieves who had stolen from the garden. A similar usage of the word *stipes*, although not mentioned by Birt, is attested in Seneca (*Dial.* 6.20.3, *alii per obscena stipitem egerunt*), where it is the executioner’s stake for impaling criminals. It is relevant that Priapus is not elsewhere called *stipes*. Although Birt’s interpretation seems possible, of the two stakes, Priapus and his phallus, I am inclined to prefer the god, especially because of the word *sacer*, which properly applies to the god (although metonymy cannot be ruled out completely). It should, therefore, be safe to accept Bücheler’s explanation that “*sacer stipes est ligneus Priapus*”. As is pointed out by Birt, the word *colonus* was in late Latin associated more broadly with *cultus* and so in the poem of Sidonius it should mean a worshipper or practitioner of a religion or virtue, in this case the *sacri stipitis* which is the objective genitive.²²⁵ Accordingly, it isn’t Petronius who “cultivates”, as a gardener, the gardens in Massalia where statues of Priapus are found, but Petronius who cultivates Priapus whose wooden effigies are found throughout gardens in Massalia.²²⁶ There is an important difference, because the phrase *Massiliensium per hortos* does not indicate any movement or action performed by Petronius that could possibly refer to a lost episode in the *Satyrice*.

The reductive method of reading fictive personal recollections became the dominant approach of the ancient grammarians in their commentaries.

²²³ Bücheler 1862, *ad Fr.* IV, who says the idea had been adumbrated by Lilius Gyraldus, was the first to unravel the biographical fallacy in Sidonius’ reading by noting that the poet “thought that Petronius was the same as Encolpius” (*ratus uidelicet eundem esse Petronium atque Encolpium*).

²²⁴ Birt 1925, 95–6; Cichorius 1922, 439.

²²⁵ This usage of *colonus* is attested in fourth and early fifth-century Christian writers, i.e., in the writings of the immediate predecessors of Sidonius: Hier. *In Is.* 54.15; Ruf. *Clem.* 6.2; Paul. Nol. *Carm.* 26.333, Ps.-Cypr. *Carm.* 2.31.

²²⁶ A very different interpretation is advanced by Anderson 1934, 22.

Maurus Servius above and Aelius Donatus were just such erudite figures. They belong to the fourth century and are therefore earlier than Sidonius.²²⁷ (In this tradition the *Eclogues* of Virgil, for example, were read as the masked autobiography of the poet containing important historical testimony.) Similarly, Augustine shows some doubt as to whether he should believe the truth of Apuleius' statement "about himself" (*inscribit sibi ipsi accidisse*) in the *Metamorphoses* that he had been changed into an ass, but he does not hesitate to apply Lucius' statement to Apuleius himself.²²⁸ This merely confirms what the Christian Saint himself confesses to in his work; as a young man he had gone through the grinding mill of pagan education in the classics. Medieval scribes even supplied the *praenomen* "Lucius" to Apuleius' name in MSS of his works.

Now, before we go any further in interpreting this fragment, let us identify its intertextual relationship with the *Satyrica*. The three relevant lines:

155 et te Massiliensium per hortos
sacri stipitis, Arbiter, colonum
Hellespontiaco parem Priapo?

are clearly modeled on *Satyrica* 139.2:

14 me quoque per terras, per cani Nereos aequor
Hellespontiaci sequitur gravis ira Priapi.

'me, too, through lands, over hoary Nereus' surface,
haunts the heavy wrath of Hellespontiac Priapus.'

To my knowledge, this observation has never been made before, although the similarities (underlined) are too strong to be coincidental and Encolpius' last line is, in turn, a reworking of Virgil (*G.* 4.111, *Hellespontiaci servet*

²²⁷ Fulgentius (*Fr.* VII) offers more of the same when he states that [...] *Petronius Arbiter ad libidinis concitamentum myrrhinum se poculum bibisse refert* ("... Petronius Arbiter says that he drank a cup of myrrh to excite his lust").

²²⁸ August. *C.D.* 18.18, ... *nec tamen in eis mentem fieri bestialem, sed rationalem humanamque servari, sicut Apuleius in libris quos Asini Aurei titulo inscripsit sibi ipsi accidisse, ut accepto veneno humano animo permanente asinus fieret, aut indicavit aut finxit* ("... not that their minds would become bestial, but instead they would retain a rational and human mind, as for example Apuleius either discloses about himself or deliberately makes up that after being poisoned he was turned into a donkey and yet retained his human consciousness").

tutela Priapi).²²⁹ We may therefore be certain—if certainty is ever attainable in such arguments—that Sidonius was practicing what must have seemed to him a clever biographical reading, reducing the fiction of the story by twisting the words of Encolpius and applying them to Petronius.

It is noteworthy that Rose 1971, 55, and others who have tried to reconstruct the author's biography, do not take issue with the implications of the ancient biographical tradition that associates Petronius with Massalia, although one would think this to be of major importance for the subject. For Rose, Massalia (in *Fragments* I and IV) belongs both to the missing text of the *Satyrica* and is a part of Petronius' biography, since he conjectured that Petronius possibly got his education there. The biography of Petronius is clearly written on the basis of the text of the *Satyrica*—a case of what I called fictionalizing Petronius in section 1.1—but the text of the *Satyrica* is also seen to supply the motivation for its own production: "It might be that [Petronius] was unfavorably impressed by the austere and puritanical reputation of the town, and took a literary revenge by making it the scene of ribald adventures" (Rose *loc. cit.*).

My interpretation raises a question about the condition of the *Satyrica*'s text in the late fifth century. Why did Sidonius choose for his parody a poem taken from a later book of the *Satyrica* (book 16?) that happens to be extant today? Considering the probable vastness of the original work, the likelihood that this should happen accidentally does not seem great. It certainly would have been more to the point for him to parody the beginning, because that is where Massalia was the scene and where the causes of Encolpius' wanderings were laid out. Or was Sidonius' *Satyrica* already a reduced version resembling our own?²³⁰ The fact that Sidonius somehow knew that the narrator was from Massalia might perhaps indicate that he possessed more of the text than we do. However, the name and hometown of an ancient author do not necessarily come from the author's work. Sidonius himself was from Lugdunum (Lyons) in Gallia, a city closely associated with Massalia through traffic on the Rhône, and this might explain his interest in it. We can only know for certain at this point that he had poem 139.2 at hand,²³¹ and it might

²²⁹ A line which had been alluded to before by Ovid, *Fast.* 1.440, *Hellespontiaco victima grata deo*. The *victima* in Ovid's amusing story was the *asellus*, another phallic creature. The lines in the *Satyrica*, moreover, have Odyssean resonances (*Od.* 1.1–4); cf. *Cat.* 101 and *Verg. Aen.* 6.692–93, and the discussion of them by Conte 1986, 32–39.

²³⁰ See Richardson 1975, 292ff., for an attempt to understand when and why most of the text was lost.

²³¹ Note, however, my reading of a letter by Sidonius in section 3.2.6.

very well be the seemingly grand statement from the hero, which this particular poem contains, which drew his attention.

Two things about the meta-text of Sidonius in relation to the text of this particular poem in the *Satyrica* demonstrate the confusion of author and ego-narrator: what the bishop says about Petronius clearly recalls in form and content what Encolpius says about himself, but more obviously the detail about Petronius' supposed phallic looks betrays without doubt the identity of the narrator of the *Satyrica*. Just like Lichas, we too may recognize Encolpius by his *mentula* (105.9).²³² The result is a jocular picture of a Petronius who stays in his home town Massalia worshipping the sacred stake of Priapus found all over or throughout, *per*, the gardens of that city, being himself a phallic figure on a par with the god.

The humor is of the type “send-it-back-to-where-it-came-from”. In Sidonius' reading of the poem of Encolpius it is now Arbiter who is the speaker of the lines, and Arbiter is a Massaliot, and so the bishop deflates Encolpius' fabulous hyperbole, *per terras, per cani Nereos aequor*, by redefining the speaker's relationship with the grotesque pagan deity, and setting it in the proper biographical ambiance, *Massiliensium per hortos*. The implication is that the only dealings Petronius had with Priapus were in the gardens of his hometown. As for epic wanderings and persecution at the hand of a deity, in this he was merely spinning a yarn. That Sidonius is treating his catalogue of eloquent Roman writers in a playful manner is clear from what he has just said about Tacitus (*Carm.* 28.153, *et qui pro ingenio fluente nulli, Corneli Tacite, es tacendus ori*). The catalogue's function in the poem, a eulogy to Consentius, also makes this appropriate, for the literary worthies are listed in a *praeteritio* simply in order to be put down in comparison with the eulogized addressee.

2.1.4 Priapus

However, we must avoid giving in to interpretive delirium at this point, because Sidonius says nothing about any “crime” or “wrath of Priapus”. These ideas are found only in Encolpius' poem (139.2, *gravis ira Priapi* [“the

²³² Cf. the explanation of Bücheler 1862, *ad Fr.* IV: *par Priapo Arbiter uocatur quia Encolpius nilo deterius mutoniatus quam Mutunus tot tantasque res mentula duce gesserat, quibus etiam hodie quae extant chartulae refertae sunt* (“Arbiter is said to be on a par with Priapus, because Encolpius who is no worse equipped than the [phallic deity] Mutinus commits so many and such great deeds under the leadership of his penis as even the few sheets of the story that still exist today bear so copious a witness”).

heavy wrath of Priapus”]) where they are best read in context with the hero’s own conjecture that he was poisoned (128.2, *veneficio tactus sum*), his private parts, he thinks, put to sleep by sorcery/poisoning (138.7, *partes veneficio, credo, sopitae*) and unmanned by an “angry hand”, *manus irata* (140.12; cf. 139.2, *gravis ira Priapi*), as a punishment for an offense he committed against Priapus out of poverty and not with all of his body (133.3, *inops et rebus egenis attritus / facinus non toto corpore feci*).²³³ In earlier scholarship it was possible to expand the “wrath of Priapus” into an overarching epic structure by reading Sidonius’ poem in conjunction with *Sat.* 139.2, as if the two poems were one continuous context.²³⁴ Such contextual fusion can have disastrous consequences for interpretation. Sidonius merely says that Encolpius (*alias* Arbiter) is from Massalia, and that he is the “equal” of the garden deity Priapus. In other words, the poem of Sidonius does not provide independent evidence that the *gravis ira Priapi* was a unifying motif in the *Satyrica* from the beginning of the plot in Massalia, contrary to what has often been asserted.²³⁵

This conjecture is not called for and in fact it creates obstacles when we try to reconstruct the opening of the plot, because in consequence a certain over-determination of factual causes for Encolpius’ leaving his home city occurs: he is exiled as a scapegoat, *and* forced to leave the city because of

²³³ *Sat.* 133.3 is discussed in detail below in section 2.2.7.

²³⁴ This is originally an idea of Elimar Klebs, though he attributes it to Bücheler. Bücheler’s 1862 comment on the text runs as follows: *re vera denotasse mihi illis uerbis Sidonius uideatur ea quae in satiris Petronius narrauerat, ratus uidelicet eundem esse Petronium atque Encolpium qui primas harum fabularum partes agebat. sacer stipes est ligneus Priapus, sacri stipitis per hortos Massiliensium colonum dicit eum qui sacra Priapi apud Massilienses coluit, aut fortasse respiciens ad rem singularem relatam a Petronio eum qui aliquando in Massiliensibus hortis dedicauit Priapum (ad Fr. IV)* (“in fact, it seems to me that with these words Sidonius has pointed to material told by Petronius in his *Satires*, no doubt under the impression that Petronius was Encolpius, the main character of these tales. The hallowed tree trunk is the wooden Priapus, and he calls him a worshipper of the hallowed tree trunk throughout the gardens of Massalia, he who practiced the sacred rites of Priapus among the Massaliots, or perhaps having in mind a specific incident told by Petronius, he who at some time dedicated a Priapus in gardens of Massalia”). What is put forward by Bücheler as a possible (*aut fortasse*) episode or incident in the story (*res singularis*) becomes in the words of Klebs 1889, 623, much more definite: *Bücheler zuerst aufmerksam machte, daß Priapus im Roman eine bedeutende Rolle spielte*. The supposed Priapic happenings in Massalia were further elaborated by Cichorius 1922, 438–442, in an untenable interpretation of the fragment.

²³⁵ This view seems to be making a come-back in the scholarship; see Schmeling 1994/5, 213, who adds the detail that Encolpius was struck impotent by Priapus already in Massalia. But if he has been impotent all along, how can we explain his surprise at finding himself unable to get an erection in Croton?

some *facinus* he committed there against Priapus. The interpretation also makes too much of the anger of Priapus, which is likely to be no more than the subjective understanding of Encolpius, who in the episode where it occurs is desperately trying to explain and remedy his impotence. The old thesis of the wrath of Priapus was indeed never fully accepted, since it tended not to solve but to complicate the problem, and since the arguments it relied on were tenuous in the first place. Unfortunately, it eventually provoked hyper-skeptical responses which, so to speak, threw the baby out with the bath water.²³⁶ For even if there is no evidence for a Priapic episode in Massalia, it does not follow that a comic conception of the “wrath of Priapus” did not play an important role in the Croton episode which may have connected it with an earlier episode.

The earliest and only incident that fits the description of a crime against Priapus belongs to Encolpius’ dealings with Quartilla’s cult of Priapus (discussed further in section 2.1.9).²³⁷ In that episode, moreover, we have an explicit *facinus* against the god (20. 1, *facinus*, and 133.3 v. 9, *facinus*), committed in a temple, out of poverty, and very likely with the help of Encolpius’ over-sized *mentula*, which made him able to impersonate Priapus himself, and so would fit his own description of the “crime” (133.3 vv. 7–10). In fact, the trick played on the cult of Quartilla before the *Crypta* conforms nicely to Encolpius’ retrospective speculations, which refer to a previously narrated episode, although the presumed causal link between that past crime and his present impotent condition is based on suspicious evidence to say the least.²³⁸ The epic description of his wandering, “through lands, over hoary Nereus’ surface”—*per terras, per cani Nereos aequor* (139.2 v. 14), which is spoken in Croton, is accurate enough if taken to allude to the protagonist’s travels since the incidents in the *urbs Graeca*. He has voyaged by sea from the harbor of the city to the gulf of Tarentum, and thence moved on foot to Croton (the plural in *terras* need only be parodic hyperbole to en-

²³⁶ See especially Baldwin 1973, 294–96; Slater 1990, 40. On the century-old debate, see Klebs 1889, 623–35; Cichorius 1922, 438–42; Perry 1925, 31f.; Birt 1925, 95–6; Anderson 1934, 20; Bagnani 1956, 23–7; Pack 1960, 31–2; Courtney 1962, 95–6; Sullivan 1968, 40 *et passim*; Mulroy 1970, 254–6; Walsh 1970, 73, 77; Rankin 1971, 52–67; and McDermott 1983, 82–85.

²³⁷ The killing of the sacred goose, 136.4–137.12, occurs after Encolpius finds himself impotent and also after he “ascertains” that the cause of it lies in the crime he committed against Priapus. In any case he quickly expiates the crime with a payment of two gold pieces.

²³⁸ The “evidence” is Giton’s statement (133.2) that Ascyrtos, too, did not perform sexually on that night after the dinner at Trimalchio’s, which was his first opportunity to have sex after the effects of the aphrodisiac they drank at Quartilla’s had worn off. But Giton, who has good reasons to fear Encolpius’ jealousy, is a most unreliable witness on this account.

hance the vaunted similarities with Odysseus and other oldies). The point of Encolpius' poem is not that he has been fleeing Priapus over sea and land. Not even Odysseus, his model, was fleeing Poseidon (the god was merely delaying the completion of the hero's *nostos*). Rather, Encolpius seems surprised that the punishment for a crime he committed in the Greek city should hit him so far away in Croton. This he comically takes as proof of the might of the deity he thinks he is up against, and on the basis of that fantastic idea he fancies himself a hero, much needing to assert himself psychologically in a moment of physical weakness.

But what if Priapus nevertheless featured in the opening episode in Mas-salia? What could his function have been? As Heinze showed over a century ago, in response to Klebs' thesis about the "wrath of Priapus", the role of Priapus in the *Satyrical* does not follow the conventions of epic, where gods come down to earth and meddle directly in human affairs, but resembles the more distant and mystical role of the gods in the fully extant ancient erotic fictions.²³⁹ The *Satyrical*'s divine apparatus further resembles that of the other stories in the frequent references made by the protagonists to the mostly hostile force of *Fortuna* (*Sat.* 13.1, 13.4, 82.6, 100.3, 101.1, 114.8, 125.2) or Τύχη.²⁴⁰ These frequent references to the vicissitudes of fortune may in fact be a generic marker of this kind of narrative, as Karl Bürger had argued even before Heinze,²⁴¹ relying on Cicero's inclusion of them as a defining characteristic.²⁴²

In ancient erotic fictions the gods do not interfere in the action directly in the epic manner, but they are there in the background often for reasons of divine envy, and may provide theological explanations for the misfortune or salvation of the protagonists. In Hippothous' story above, the boys love each other greatly until an evil spirit gets envious and grudges them their happiness (καὶ χρόνῳ συνήμεν πολλῶ, στέργοντες ἀλλήλους διαφερόντως, ἕως δαίμων τις ἡμῖν ἐνεμέσησε). In Chariton, beautiful Callirhoë is a devout worshipper of Aphrodite, and so it is Chaereas' untimely jealousy which

²³⁹ Heinze 1899, 501–2.

²⁴⁰ Heinze 1899, 502, also mentions the possible use of a foreshadowing oracle in the original *Satyrical* (*Fr.* XXXVII).

²⁴¹ Bürger 1892, 349.

²⁴² *Inv.* 1.19, *Hoc in genere narrationis multa debet inesse festivitas confecta ex rerum varietate, animorum dissimilitudine, gravitate, levitate, spe, metu, suspicione, desiderio, dissimulatione, errore, misericordia, fortunae commutatione, insperato incommodo, subita laetitia, iucundo exitu rerum* ("In this form of narrative there should be great liveliness, resulting from variety of events, contrast of characters, severity, levity, hope, fear, suspicion, desire, deception, error, compassion, change of fortune, unexpected trouble, sudden joy, and a happy ending").

provokes the goddess' anger (8.1, ὀργισθεῖσα χαλεπῶς διὰ τὴν ἄκαιρον ζήλοτυπίαν). In Xenophon of Ephesus, Habrocomes arrogantly claims that he is more handsome and powerful than Eros, which of course makes the god furious (μητιᾶ πρὸς ταῦτα ὁ Ἔρωσ). The most direct involvement of these gods is when they appear in a character's dream and provide information that will influence the course of events, as in Longus, when the Nymphs appear to Daphnis and tell him where he will find a purse with three thousand drachmas (3.27), or in the *Metamorphoses*, when Isis appears to Lucius the Ass in a dream and instructs him as to where he may find the antidote that will release him from the spell and return him to human form,²⁴³ or in the *Satyrica*, when Lichas and Tryphaena dream respectively of Priapus and the effigy of Neptune, who inform them that the boys have been led back to the ship and will be found there (104.1–2). Other dream epiphanies could be mentioned that do not provide such detailed information about later events in the story, but will nevertheless “come true” in some sense.²⁴⁴ God-sent dreams, as well as divine oracles and utterances by priests in trance,²⁴⁵ conform to normal ancient religious experience and practice. The manner of divine interference in ancient fiction could be described as a function of the cosmological status of the characters, viz. they exist in a post-heroic age when gods no longer mingle with mortals.

Since only such indirect involvement by the gods is allowed in the genre,²⁴⁶ Priapus can have entered the plot as early as Massalia no more di-

²⁴³ “I had scarcely closed my eyes” (11.3, *necdum satis coniuveram*), he says, just before the vision, and after it, I “was quickly released from sleep” (11.7, *somno protinus absolutus*).

²⁴⁴ Such as Quartilla's dream inquiry in the temple (17.7, *medicinam somno petii, iussa que sum vos perquirere atque impetum morbi monstrata subtilitate lenire* [“I sought the remedy in a dream, and was told to seek you out and relieve the onset of the illness by a precise ritual that was revealed to me”]); the dream of Apollonius where an “angel” instructs him to go to Ephesus where he will find his “dead” wife (48). Comparable is Osiris' appearance to Lucius in a god-sent dream (11.29, *divinum somnium*) to instruct him about further initiation; and in Achilles Tatius, when Artemis appears to Leucippe in a dream and assures her that she will preserve her virginity (4.1).

²⁴⁵ E.g. in Xenophon of Ephesus, when an oracle of the temple of Apollo in Colophon at the beginning foretells some elements of the story (1.6), or when the children outside the temple of Apis in Memphis assure Anthia that she will recover her husband Habrocomes (5.4), or in the *Metamorphoses*, when the priest of Isis prophesies to Lucius in a trance (11.14, *vultu . . . inhumano*; 11.16, *vaticinatus sacerdos*).

²⁴⁶ Although Quartilla's statement in 17.5, *nostra regio tam praesentibus plena est numinibus ut facilius possis deum quam hominem invenire* (“our region is so full of divine presence that you are more likely to run into a god than a man”), is sometimes used to suggest the presence of the supernatural in the *Satyrica*, the words are entirely subjective to the priestess, and probably serve the purpose of excusing how easily she mistook Encolpius for Pria-

rectly than by grudging Encolpius and Giton their erotic pleasures, or, and perhaps more likely, because Encolpius was his equal with respect to the size of his *mentula* and may have inadvertently entered into competition with the god for the attention of worshippers. Nothing provokes divine anger like the impersonation of a god by a mortal, which is really what is implied by Sidonius, when he apostrophizes Petronius and calls him, or rather Encolpius, *Hellespontiaco parem Priapo*. If I am right in conjecturing that Encolpius impersonated Priapus when he disturbed the nocturnal ceremonies of Quartilla and her Priapic cult, this would either be a repetition of an earlier motif or the only cause of the “wrath of Priapus”. No direct epic-style confrontation or *facinus* is therefore necessary or even possible and we can let the information from this fragment (*Fr. I*) suffice as an explanation of how and why Encolpius left his home city of Massalia.

2.1.5 Encolpius, Scapegoat and Exile

So far our reading of the two fragments of Servius and Sidonius has yielded information about Encolpius’ citizenship, poverty, voluntary assumption of the degrading role of scapegoat, and final expulsion from Massalia. If this information is right, we would expect some of it to be reflected in what Encolpius says about himself in the fragments of his narrative that have come down to us. Two passages in the extant text of the *Satyrica* fall into place as soon as we accept this information. Firstly, Encolpius refers to himself as *exul* (81.3) in a retrospective soliloquy at a moment of disillusion when he has no reason to misrepresent himself to the original audience/reader, who already knows the facts from hearing/reading the story; and secondly, Lichas refers to him directly with the Greek word for scapegoat (*pharmace*): “What do you have to say for yourself, you thief? What stray salamander has burnt off your eyebrows? To what god have you offered your hair? Answer me, you scapegoat!” (107, 15, *quid dicis tu latro? quae sola salamandra supercilia tua exussit? cui deo crinem vovisti? pharmace, responde!*). These retrospective references to the protagonist in the extant *Satyrica* match so perfectly the fragment of Servius—in both Encolpius is an exile and a scapegoat—that their appositeness is most unlikely to be merely coincidental. As a result we have no choice but to accept as genuine the extant information about Encolpius in Massalia at the beginning of the full-text *Satyrica*.

Let us first look closer at the reference to Encolpius’ scapegoatery and then move to the question of his exile. That *pharmace* should be considered

pus himself.

Greek, transcribed with Latin letters, is proven by the fact that it occurs only here in extant Latin literature, so far as I have been able to ascertain. As Harlow has shown, *pharmace* is correctly read as the Greek vocative *φαρμακέ*, “scapegoat”.²⁴⁷ The word belongs to the vocabulary of Greek satiric and comic authors such as Hipponax and Aristophanes and is used as a term of abuse, and so it might possibly occur here without a reference to anything specific.²⁴⁸ However, the other two items in the same address *do* have references to specific facts about Encolpius: he *has* stolen things from the ship and he *has* lost his eyebrows. The force of Lichas’ question above is not that he himself believes that “a stray salamander” leaped from the sea aboard the ship and burnt off his eyebrows, but that he is mockingly anticipating some such far-fetched explanation from Encolpius.²⁴⁹ By rounding off his attack by nastily reminding Encolpius of the humiliation he underwent in Massalia as a “scapegoat”, Lichas delivers a serious blow to the ego of our hero. Significantly, Encolpius the narrator immediately acknowledges the truth of Lichas’ accusations: “and I couldn’t invent anything to say against this accusation of a most obvious guilt” (108.1, *nec quid in re manifestissima dicerem inveniebam*).

Let us now examine the description of Encolpius as an exile (81.3) and the significance of this for the story. Besides Encolpius, there are two other *exules* in the story. Tryphaena calls Giton an *exul* (100.4), and she herself is so referred to (100.7, *exulem*) by Eumolpus, when addressing Encolpius and Giton who would certainly know the facts about her exile.²⁵⁰ It should be

²⁴⁷ Harlow 1974, 377.

²⁴⁸ E.g. Hippon. *Fr.* 7 [West], *et passim*; *Ar. Ra.* 733. The early commentator Janus Souza read *pharmace* as the vocative of *φαρμακός* (Burman 1743, 2:38). *LSJ* (s.v.) derives the abusive sense of *φαρμακός*, ‘scapegoat’, from the fact that criminals could be used as scapegoats. Strangely, however, translators of the *Satyrice* have usually taken *pharmace* here for another Greek word *φάρμακος* (on the accent see the grammarian Herodianus 1.150 [Lentz]) meaning ‘sorcerer’ and translated it as ‘empoisonneur’ (Ernout), ‘Giftmischer, Zauberer’ (Stefenelli), ‘poisonous fellow’ (Heseltine), ‘poisonous creature’ (Sullivan), ‘snake in the grass’ (Branham and Kinney). The word is found e.g. in the vocabulary of the Greek *LXX*. The problem with this reading is that we have no reason to suspect Encolpius of magical practices.

²⁴⁹ A marine animal similar to the salamander, possibly some sort of “mollusc”, is said by Pliny (*Nat.* 10.188) to emit a substance with depilatory effects.

²⁵⁰ Encolpius at one point claims that Ascyrtos was “by his own admission worthy of exile” (81.4, *sua quoque confessione dignus exilio*), which could possibly indicate that there was a fourth exile in the story. The *editio Pithoena* has *exito*, but it is not supported by other witnesses, and shortly before Encolpius has spoken of Ascyrtos and himself as having experienced similar fortune (80.8). But even if Ascyrtos is an exile he is unlikely to originate from Massalia, because he was clearly not on the ship of Lichas with the others. He is not a protagonist and both enters the story and disappears from it in Campania.

noted that the words *exilium* and *exul* were not used lightly in the Latin language and rarely in a transferred sense and then only of inanimate things and animals. Moreover, the terms are without abusive connotations (as opposed to *fugitivus*, “runaway”, “fugitive”) since they usually involve people of some rank and standing. An *exilium* is either a legal banishment (the legal terms are *expulsio*, *ieictio*, *aquae et ignis interdictio*, *deportatio* and *relegatio*), or a voluntary emigration (*demigratio*, *fuga*, *peregrinatio*). There is always in these terms an implicit contrast to *patria* and *domus*. For these three Greek characters in our story to be called *exules* in Campania and thereabouts proves that they are not Roman citizens, but come from an independent city outside Roman territory. That city is most likely as Greek as they are themselves.

The best way to explain the institution of exile in the Roman world is to consider it in the light of legal arrangements between independent states. An exiled Roman citizen could through the *ius exulandi*, “the right to live in exile”, adopt a new *patria* and thus forfeit his Roman citizenship.²⁵¹ This arrangement was reciprocal and *exules* from independent cities which had a *foedus* with Rome could take up citizenship there and thus relinquish their previous status at home (Cic. *de Orat.* 1.177). In early times the exiled Roman did not need to go far into exile and could find a new home without leaving Latium, in cities such as Tibur, Praeneste, Lavinium and Ardea, or he could go to the Latin colonies. In later times Tarquinii, Nuceria and Ravenna would serve the same purposes. But when the *ager Romanus* had been expanded so as to cover the whole Italian peninsula and especially after the civil wars, when all Italian cities had been granted Roman citizenship, such places had to be sought outside Italy, in Gallia, Greece or Asia (Cic. *Mur.* 89). In the early principate the closest foreign city to the North and West, and one that was preeminently qualified to accept Roman exiles, happened to be Massalia. This independent Greek city-state, lying in the middle of the Roman province of Gallia Narbonensis, had had a politically privileged status in the area ever since the war against the Gallic tribes in 123–121 B.C.E.²⁵² In Roman sources, moreover, it is often mentioned as the preferred destination of Roman *exules*.

tagonist and both enters the story and disappears from it in Campania.

²⁵¹ See Kleinfeller 1958, 1683–1685.

²⁵² Strabo has a chapter on Massalia (Str. 4.1.4f.). In the early principate Massalia was still an officially independent Greek city-state which laid great store by its ancient customs and citizenship and had a long standing relationship of *amicitia* with the Romans. In Strabo’s time (ca. 63 B.C.E. – 19 C.E.) the city had a high reputation for its rhetorical and philosophical schools which attracted upper class Romans. Tacitus corroborates this reputation of

Even before the civil war, in 70 B.C.E., the corrupt former governor of Sicily, C. Verres, chose Massalia as his city of exile and took there much wealth. In 63 B.C.E. it seemed the obvious place to go to for Catilina, if he had chosen exile (*Sal. Cat.* 34.2). Milo, too, went there in 52 B.C.E. (*Asc. Mil.* 32.13; 45.23), became a citizen and despite his discontent could joke that he was happy to be in exile because of the excellent mullet of Massalia (D.C. 40.54). After the execution of Jullus Antonius by the order of Augustus, in relation to the adultery of Julia (2 B.C.E.), his adolescent son Lucius Antonius was sent to Massalia “where his exile would be hidden by the pretense of study” (*Tac. Ann.* 4.44, *ubi specie studiorum nomen exilii tegeretur*). Tacitus reports an interesting embassy to Tiberius in 25 C.E. undertaken by the Massaliots to ask for the legitimation of the testament of a certain Vulcancius Moschus, who had left his property to the city *ut patriae* (*Ann.* 4.43.5). This well known rhetor (*Sen. Suas.* 1.2; *Con.* 2.3.4 *et passim*) was born in Pergamum (Porphyrius *De Hor. ep.* 1.4.9), but had to face charges of murder by poison and therefore left Pergamum, despite his defense by Asinius Pollio (*Sen. Con.* 2.5.13) and Torquatus, Horace’s friend (*Ep.* 1.5.9). Later he had settled in Massalia as a rhetor. The Massaliots brought the case before Tiberius to test the validity of the *ius exulandi* in Massalia, which was thus reaffirmed. Seneca wrote to Nero about a father who had shown his clemency to a son who had made an attempt on his life: “satisfying himself with exile—and a luxurious exile—he detained the parricide at Massalia and gave him the same liberal allowance that he had before” (*Cl.* 1.15.2). Finally, in 58 C.E., Nero on false charges bade Cornelius Sulla leave Rome and stay within the walls of Massalia (*Tac. Ann.* 13.47.3). These walls had been torn down by Caesar in 49 B.C.E., but were reconstructed by the wealthy Massaliot doctor, Crinas, with Nero’s permission (*Plin. Nat.* 29.9).

Given the reciprocity of the institution of *exilium*, the frequency with which the Romans themselves chose Massalia as their place of exile makes this city the most probable, if not the only possible, place of origin of our first-century Greek *exules* on board a Tarentine ship heading south along the west coast of the Italian peninsula. Since we know that Encolpius is a Massaliot, and we may assume that he left the city by sea on the ship of Lichas, a merchant who would have had commercial reasons for going to Massalia, the conclusion is hard to resist that Giton and Tryphaena originate from Massalia, are likewise exiles and were also on that ship. The great complexity of the relationships of Encolpius, Tryphaena, Giton, Lichas and his wife

the Massaliots for rhetorical and philosophical skills (*Ann.* 4.44, *Ag.* 4). For a concise account of ancient Massalia, see Wackernagel 1966, 2130–2153.

(discussed in detail below), which is evident from the reciprocal accusations and apologies when the boys board the ship again in the Greek city, requires them to have spent considerable time together on that ship before arriving in Campania.

2.1.6 The Significance of Massalia

In Roman literature the name of Massalia (or *Massilia* as the Romans spelled it) is loaded with political and cultural significance. The city's destiny was perceived as intimately connected with that of Rome from its very foundation. Legend had it that in the times of king Tarquinius the youthful settlers from Phocaea, which is sometimes portrayed as another sacked Troy (Luc. 3.340), had sailed up the Tiber and made friends with the Romans before continuing on their journey to found Massalia in the midst of savage nations.²⁵³ For the Romans they remained a symbol of the old Greek civilization miraculously preserved in the heart of barbarian darkness.²⁵⁴ Severity, gravity and discipline were the communal virtues of Massaliots lauded by Roman authors (Cic. *Flacc.* 26.63; *Phil.* 8.6.19; V.Max. 2.6.7). These were virtues that the Romans did not commonly associate with Greeks, but rather with their own *vetus Roma*. Massalia was believed to have provided financial aid after the sack of Rome by Gauls, and for this, according to Justin (Just. 43.5.10), it was granted "immunity" (*immunitas*), "an auditors' place in the senate" (*locus spectaculorum in senatu*), and "a treaty of equal right" (*foedus aequo iure*). Like Rome it fought against the Carthaginians. It had the reputation of a faithful friend and ally to Rome in war and peace (Just. 43.5.3). Accordingly, the siege and subsequent capitulation of Massalia to Caesar during the civil war was perceived as symbolic of the irreparable harm and madness of that conflict. For Rome to turn against such an ally was typical of the self-destructive fraternal slaughter that was the civil war. In the account given by Lucan in the *Pharsalia* (3.298f.), the Massaliots face Caesar with "an un-Greek steadfastness" (Luc. 3.302, *non Graia levitate*) and they appeal to him by reminding him of the historical relationship of the two states and demonstrating clearly their old fashioned hatred of tyranny and civil strife. Civil wars are evil, and if Rome has the good fortune to negotiate

²⁵³ There is a short history of Massalia in Justin 43.3–5, which is an epitome of Trogus' *Historiae Philippicae* from the first century B.C.E.

²⁵⁴ This aspect of the city's image is emphasized in numerous sources: Cic. *Flacc.* 63, *Phil.* 8.9; Liv. 37.54; Sil. 15.168–72; V.Max. 2.6.7; Tac. *Ag.* 4; Mela 2.77.

peace, Caesar and Pompey can both come to Massalia to dwell there in exile (Luc. 3.333–335).

Thus Massalia, like Troy in the poem of Eumolpus about the fall of Troy (*Sat.* 89), might be presented as a projection of Rome herself with respect to her fate in the civil war, the subject of another of Eumolpus' poems (*Sat.* 119–124). The logic of the admiration of Massalia by the Romans is explained by A. Trevor Hodge in the following manner: "Romans, almost without exception, were fulsome in their admiration, praising the Massaliots as a kind of puritan supermen, while speaking of their politics and foreign policy in terminology that tends painfully to remind a modern ear of a right-winger speaking of a friendly banana republic."

Greek writers, however, have quite a different story to tell, and one that resonates better with the tenor we are familiar with in the story told in our fragments of the *Satyrical*. They saw Massalia, again in the words of A. Trevor Hodge, "as a kind of 'Naughty Paree, O-la-la!'"²⁵⁵ In Greek texts the Massaliots have a reputation for being effeminate and soft, which is proven by the fact that they wear floor-length tunics (Athen. 12, 523, c; Ps. Plutarch *Proverb. Alex.* 60). The phrase "you might sail to Massalia" (Suid. ε 499, ἐς Μασσαλίαν πλεύσειας) is explained in the late tenth-century Byzantine lexicon the *Suda* in the following way: "Used of those living an effeminate and soft life, since the people of Massalia used to live rather effeminately, wearing fancy long robes and perfumes" (ἐπὶ τῶν θηλυτέρως καὶ μαλακῶς ζώντων. οἱ γὰρ Μασσαλιῶται θηλυτέρον ἔζων στολαῖς ποικίλαις καὶ ποδήρεσι καὶ μύροις χρώμενοι). In the same fashion, the phrase "you are coming from Massalia" (Suid. ε 3161, ἐκ Μασσαλίας ἦκεις) gets the gloss: "Used of effeminate and luxury-loving people, inasmuch as the men of Massalia are said to wear effeminate clothing and perfume, and tie their hair up, and are a disgrace because of this softness" (ἐπὶ τῶν θηλυδριῶν καὶ τεθρυμμένων, παρόσον ἐκείνους φασὶ θηλυτέρον στολίζεσθαι μεμυρισμένους καὶ τὰς τρίχαι ἀναδουμένους, καὶ διὰ ταύτην τὴν μαλαίκαν ἀσχημονεῖς). Another noted peculiarity of the Massaliots is male proper names with feminine endings: Protis, Apellis, Thespis, Zenothemis, Taxaris, Charmis. The only Roman writer who adopts this Greek attitude towards the Massaliots is the comic dramatist Plautus, who lets a character refer to effeminacy as "practicing the morals of the Massaliots" (Plaut. *Cas.* 963). This atypical attitude for a Roman text could be explained by Plautus' own admission that he adapted the *Casina* from a play by the third-century Greek poet of New Comedy, Diphilus of Sinope.

²⁵⁵ Both citations are from Hodge 1998, 4.

As far as we can tell, Massalia appears to have been an old-fashioned city state with an aristocratic constitution, and very conservative with respect to its religious customs and the Greek language. An archaic Ionic dialect held its ground there, and Greek continued to be the spoken language until late antiquity.²⁵⁶ Encolpius' marked preference for old Greek literature and art, and his apparently genuine astonishment at things seen and heard on his trip through Italy under the Julio-Claudian dynasty, are thus intelligible as aspects of his Massaliotic background. His surprise is therefore not due to stupidity, but to his foreign and culturally "finer" origin, and may to a certain extent be used to measure the deviant mores of those whom he encounters. Because of his background, Encolpius stands closer to the admirable Greeks of the past than do those characters of the story who are more familiar with and accepting of the contemporary scene. His simple-mindedness is obviously at least in part intended as an intellectual virtue, and his literary mindset and nostalgia for the past glory of Greece is more appealing to his fine Roman audience than the world of sordid acquisitiveness. At the same time the joke is always on Encolpius, because of his Massaliotic effeminacy, his softness and obsession with Giton and his scholastic way of reacting to the world. The phallic Encolpius is a contemporary satyr, a comic figure, but not in any comprehensible sense a parody of the male protagonists of the Greek novel.

There is another reason why Massalia is especially appropriate as the origin of the narrator of the *Satyrica*. Encolpius' home city, which prided itself on having a port of major commercial importance in the western Mediterranean, was famous for its Atlantic seafarers and their incredible travelogues. Pytheas of Massalia, for one, claimed to have sailed into the outer-sea and north along the coast. His voyage supposedly took him to many previously unknown lands and led to the discovery of the mysterious island of Thule. But he was branded the very worst of liars by Strabo (1.4.3) and mocked by Polybios (34.5.7) as someone too poor—another poor Massaliot—to undertake an expedition to far-away places. Antonius Diogenes certainly parodies Pytheas amongst others in his lost *The Wonders beyond Thule* (Phot. *Bibl. Cod.* 166). Euthymenes, another Massaliot adventurer, claimed to have rounded the southern tip of Africa and located the Nile's source and thus solved this centuries-long debate. But he is called a braggart by the sophist Aelius Aristides and his *Periplous* nothing but an "account for

²⁵⁶ See Clerc 1971, 1:458–564, on the intellectual culture. The Greek inscriptions of Massalia dating from the Roman era are notable for their archaic and Ionian forms, though this may perhaps be due to an officially cultivated archaism to boost local patriotism rather than the survival of the old dialect in common speech.

Alkinous” (Aristid. *Aeg.* p.354 [Jebb], ἀπόλογος Ἀλκίνου), i.e. of the same type as the lying fables told by Odysseus to the gullible king of the Phaeacians. The Younger Seneca cites Euthymenes of Massalia only to refute his claims, and adds that in the olden days “there was room for lies; because the realms of the outer sea were unexplored, they were allowed to make up fables” (Sen. *Nat.* 4.2.22–25, *tunc erat mendacio locus; cum ignota essent externa, licebat illis fabulas mittere*). Lucan, with an obvious allusion to Nero’s interest in the problem of the sources of the Nile (Sen. *Nat.* 6.8.3), also refers to the Massaliot’s story as hearsay, *rumor*, in a conversation between Caesar and Acoreus, an Egyptian priest (Luc. 10.255–7). Because of such incredible travelers’ tales connected with the city of Massalia, Aelius Aristides uses the term ‘Massaliotic fables’ (*Aeg.* p.353 [Jebb], μῦθοι Μασσαλιωτικοί) to cover this type of travelogue and relies on his readers to know to what he is referring. Whether the Massaliots Pytheas and Euthymenes were mere liars or misunderstood explorers far ahead of their time is difficult to ascertain, but it is certain that they were known to later authors as Odyssean spinners of yarns, which makes their city especially appropriate as the home of Encolpius, the narrator of the travelogue we know as the *Satyrica*.

The outlines of what happened in the first episode in Massalia are not difficult to reconstruct based on such evidence as the Servius fragment and the formulaic frames of Greek travelogues. Like strangers in Greek literature typically do, Encolpius will have begun his tale by identifying himself through his city of origin. He will further have associated with his Massaliotic identity the qualities that define him most as a character and a narrator: a noble mindset, old-style education and travel, alluding also to his ‘softness’ and love for Giton. His education and taste fit well with the image of Massalia as a university town in imperial times, and his travels fit well with the fact that Massalia counted among its famous citizens certain travelers who explored the outer-ocean and came back to tell incredible tales. One does not have to ponder long the possibility of a discursive strategy for the opening of this story to see how the hackneyed motif of the Phaeacian tales of Odysseus could here be given yet another creative spin in Greek literature. The whole set-up is highly adaptable for an ancient Greek satire about literature, human attitudes and morals. The Odyssean traveler who goes from city to city and gets to know many places and the minds of many men is an ideal vehicle for such a satire. Rather than taking a trip to the fabulous edges of the world, as his fellow Massaliots claimed to have done, the overeducated but unheroic Encolpius goes to the heart of civilization to face moral and esthetic monstrosities of no less fabulous proportions. This movement in-

wards to the ordinary (and prosaic) and away from the mythical (and poetic) is no doubt related to the therapeutic strategy of Greek Cynic satire which ridiculed scholars for studying in detail the errors of Odysseus while being ignorant of their own. For Petronius the effeminate Massaliot provided, additionally, an ideal vehicle for a satire to subvert Roman chauvinism.

2.1.7 Sailing from Massalia

If our geographical and cultural remapping of the *Satyrice* has made more persuasive our thesis that Encolpius, Giton and Tryphaena boarded the ship of Lichas in Massalia, there is still much about their relationships and the events of the voyage that remains in the dark. We would, perhaps, know considerably more if we had Giton's hurried exposition of the causes of their enmities and the present threat, which puts fear into Eumolpus (101.7, *rap-tim causas odiorum et instans periculum trepidanti Eumolpo exponit [sc. Giton]*). But since the audience/reader of the original had all this information, the narrator does not bother repeating it. However, as will become clear in the following, it is fairly easy to recover what caused the falling-out between the characters. The enmities between Tryphaena and Lichas, on the one hand, and Encolpius and Giton, on the other, are virtually re-exposed by the narrative itself through the accusations and apologies which precede their partly forced reconciliation.

Tryphaena primarily misses Giton²⁵⁷ and Lichas is most eager to get his hands on Encolpius.²⁵⁸ In Giton's words the boys are on the run from these

²⁵⁷ 100.4, "*si quis deus manibus meis*" inquit "*Gitona imponeret, quam bene exulem exciperem*" ("If some god were to place Giton in my hands", she said, 'how well I would receive the exile'). She dreams that the statue of Neptune, which she had noticed three times in the sanctuary at Baiae, says to her "you will find Giton in Lichas' ship" (104.2, "*in nave Lichae Gitona invenies*"); cf. 108.5, *intentans in oculos Tryphaenae manus usurum me viribus meis clara liberaque voce clamavi, ni abstineret a Gitone iniuriam mulier damnata et in toto navigio sola verberanda* ("I shook my fist in Tryphaena's face, and shouted in a loud and bold voice that I would use violence, if she did not leave off insulting Giton, for she was a wicked woman and the only person on the ship who deserved flogging").

²⁵⁸ Encolpius fears Lichas especially: 100.3–4, *sed repente quasi destruyente fortuna constantiam meam eiusmodi vox super constratum puppis congenuit: "ergo me derisit?" et haec quidem virilis et paene auribus meis familiaris animum palpitantem percussit* ("But suddenly, as though fate was trying to destroy my resolution, a voice on the ship's deck groaned: 'So he made me a laughingstock?' And this manly voice was somehow familiar to my ears, and my heart beat fast as I heard it"). The Priapus of Lichas' dream says to him: 104.1, "*Encolpion quod quaeris, scito a me in navem tuam esse perductum*" ("Know that I have lead Encolpius, whom you seek, to your ship"). When Tryphaena hears Giton's voice

people (101.6, “*hi sunt*” *inquit Giton “quos fugimus*”). The angry adults accordingly refer to the boys as “runaways” and “culpable” (104.11 and 105.10, *fugitivi*; 106.3, *noxii*). At this stage the relationship between the boys and Lichas in particular is presented as that of runaway slaves to an irate master (*Sat.* 101.10). The impractical declamatory solutions which the trio scholastically invent are another demonstration of the uselessness of declamations in real life (cf. Encolpius’ claim at *Sat.* 1.1–2.4) and they never manage to represent the boys as anything but slaves who have committed some wrongdoing against their master, although Eumolpus is the one who would pose as their *dominus* (102.9, 103.4, 105.2). In his defense of Encolpius and Giton the poet presents them as “free men”, “noble” and “honest”, but even so he too refers to them as “runaway slaves” and “enemies who have surrendered” in the same sentence (107.3–5). His only effective rhetorical argument is to appeal to whatever residual sentiments there may be after the amorous liaisons of the adults and the boys (107.3–4).²⁵⁹

Eumolpus is, of course, lying outrageously in claiming that the boys willingly returned to the ship and will say whatever he thinks is going to be of help. Lichas protests to his calling the boys *ingenui* and *honesti* (107.3–5), not however by arguing that they are slaves in a legal sense, but because they have become “guilty” (107.9, *noxii*) and “liable” (107.10, *rei*) in his eyes. If Encolpius was his friend before, all the more reason to call him, besides a thief, a parricide as well (107.12).²⁶⁰ Neither boy is actually the slave of Tryphaena or Lichas. What has so debased them with respect to their former friends is that they have fallen captives (113.7, *captivitate*) to people whom they have hurt (107.10, *laesi*) and who now wish to wreak vengeance upon their heads (108.9, *dimicantium furor, illis pro ultione, nobis pro vita pugnantibus* [“the fury of the fighters, they fighting for revenge, we fighting for our lives”]). This double nature of the relationship between the people on board the ship shows that there is a dramatic switch, a “before” and “after”

and runs to him, Lichas runs to Encolpius: 105.9, *Lichas, qui me optime noverat, tamquam et ipse vocem audisset, accurrit et nec manus nec faciem meam consideravit, sed continuo ad inguina mea luminibus deflexis movit officiosam manum et “salve” inquit “Encolpi”* (“Lichas, who knew me intimately, came running as if he too had heard my voice, and did not inspect my hands or my face, but immediately looked down and applied his busy hand to my groin, saying ‘How are you, Encolpius?’”).

²⁵⁹ Cf. 106.2, *volebat Tryphaena misereri, quia non totam voluptatem perdiderat* (“Tryphaena wanted to forgive, because her pleasure had not wholly died away”).

²⁶⁰ 107.11, “*at enim amici fuerunt nostri: eo maiora meruerunt supplicia*” (“But they were once our friends [you say]: then they deserve the harsher punishment”).

in the boys' relationship with the adults, and that the partly erotic and partly criminal departure from the ship marks that turning point.²⁶¹

Harder to figure out are the original relationships in the period before the falling-out when things were apparently going more smoothly. And even before this happy period we must posit an initial encounter, no doubt when the woman and the boys first boarded the ship of Lichas in Massalia. During this initial period, then, we may presume that Tryphaena, Encolpius and Giton were primarily *exules* in the eyes of Lichas, who knew that Encolpius was exiled as a result of playing the scapegoat. The wife of Lichas (her name was most likely "Hedyle")²⁶² was also on board the ship in the beginning and seems to have had an important role to play, especially in the boys' departure from the ship. Eumolpus' answer to Encolpius' question about the owner and the passengers gives us the basic facts about the captain and his most prominent passenger, Tryphaena. Lichas and his ship are returning to their homeport in Tarentum (100.7, *dixero Licham Tarentinum esse dominum huiusce navigii*), and he has been collecting merchandise to sell presumably on the local market (101.4, *onus deferendum ad mercatum conducit*). Tryphaena is being brought on the ship to Tarentum as an exile (100.7, *huiusce navigii, qui Tryphaenam exulem Tarentum ferat?*). The same would seem to apply to the boys. Originally, they were most likely going to Tarentum.

Tryphaena is also, according to Eumolpus, the most beautiful of all women and travels hither and thither because of pleasure (101.5, *omnium feminarum formosissima, quae voluptatis causa huc atque illuc vectatur*). The reason he gives for her travels (*voluptatis causa*) might seem to conflict with her status as exile. However, if her exile had something to do with her lust, as is likely, since this seems to be her dominant character trait, this is not a problem.²⁶³ Eumolpus might also be referring to her and Lichas' search for the boys, which seems to have been their sole activity from the time the boys left the ship. Tryphaena somewhat resembles an unusually wealthy Greek *hetaira*, but considering her status as exile she is more likely to be—on the analogy of Lichas' wife and the recently married Circe in Croton—the

²⁶¹ 113.3, *non dubie redierat in animum [sc. Lichae] Hedyle expilatunque libidinosa migratione navigium* ("no doubt it was Hedyle who came to (Lichas') mind and how his ship had been pillaged on her libidinous elopement").

²⁶² Hedyle is Bücheler's conjecture for the *hedile* or *edile* of the tradition. That Lichas had a wife on board and that she played an important role, however, is not in question: 106.2, *Lichas memor adhuc uxoris corruptae iniuriarumque, quas in Herculis porticu acceperat* ("Lichas, still remembering the seduction of his wife and the insults he took in the Portico of Hercules").

²⁶³ According to the conventions of New Comedy, going into exile is the natural reaction to frustrated love, see Zagagi 1988, 193–209.

libidinous wife of a wealthy Massalioi who has abandoned husband and home. Besides, her amorous attachments would hardly be so culpable were she a professional harlot. But perhaps most significantly she blushes at the end of Eumolpus' satire about the Widow of Ephesus, a story introduced as a demonstration of female levity, how easily they fall in love, how fast they even forget their children; that no wife is so virtuous that she isn't willing to sacrifice everything for the love of a stranger (110.6–7, *peregrina libidine*). Why would she have blushed so violently (113.1, *erubescete non mediocriter Tryphaena*) if she had nothing in common with the widow of the story?

When peace has been brokered she and Giton are very close again (109.8; 110.3; 113.1 and 5). That they have been close before is shown by the fact that Tryphaena's "most faithful slaves" (114.7), especially the *ancillae*, recognize Giton's immediate cry of pain even before their mistress.²⁶⁴ She knows his voice well enough to be subliminally "upset" or "disturbed", *turbata*, at hearing it (105.5), even if she does not recognize it immediately. When all her slave girls have run to his aid and called on their mistress for help (105.6), she is quick to respond.²⁶⁵ Likewise, when Giton threatens to cut off his genitals, she stops him by showing herself earnestly willing to forgive (108.10, *inhibitque Tryphaena tam grande facinus non dissimulata missione* ["Tryphaena prevented this great disaster from happening by earnestly offering us pardon"]). Such unconditional forgiveness is a sure symptom of love (in the *Satyrice* a sentiment no different from lust) as Encolpius so well demonstrates by his willingness to take Giton back whatever he has done.²⁶⁶ The reason for the familiarity of the handmaidens with the boy is not that Giton is Tryphaena's slave, as some have suggested, but that these creatures were indispensable intermediaries in comic love affairs. Accordingly, they are especially knowledgeable about the most intimate of their mistresses' secrets. To convince ourselves of this we need only observe the likeness of Tryphaena's *ancillae* to Quartilla's Psyche and Circe's Chrysis.

²⁶⁴ The text is strange here: 105.6, *non solum ergo turbata est, sed ancillae etiam omnes familiari sono inductae ad vapulantem decurrunt*, but need not be corrupt. Bücheler hesitatingly suggests *sola* for *solum*, but prints a lacuna after *sed* and suggests the missing words: *accessit quoque propius et acrius uociferantem intuetur*. Ernout changes *ergo* to *era*, and adduces Bücheler as the authority. Müller adopts Novák's emendation and adds <ea> after *ergo*. Even if *era* is accepted, this does not necessarily imply that Giton is Tryphaena's slave, since her status as mistress would be justified by the reference to her handmaidens, and does not necessarily have anything to do with Giton.

²⁶⁵ 105.8, *deflectit aures Tryphaena iam sua sponte credentes raptimque ad puerum devolat* ("Tryphaena lent a ready ear to the cry and hurried to the boy").

²⁶⁶ Lust also motivates Encolpius when he wishes to break up his friendship with Ascylos (10.7), and love when he receives Giton back and forgives him later on (91.6).

The chambermaids of Tryphaena typically repair the beauty of the boys by restoring to them their lost hair and eyebrows with their mistress' cosmetics (110.1–5). In one isolated fragment one of them seems to be ingratiating herself with Encolpius (113.11), just as Chrysis later attempts to replace her mistress as the young man's lover (139.4). These subordinates can at times be quite imperious and they are not always under their owner's control, much like the slaves of Trimalchio (e.g. the *dispensator*).

The idea that Giton is Tryphaena's slave is contradicted by her initial reference to him as *exul* (100.4), likewise by Eumolpus' statement that the boys were once close friends with the adults (107.1, *aliquando amicissimis*), a statement which is acknowledged by Lichas (107.11, *at enim amici fuerunt nostri*). This seems an improbable way to refer to slaves in the ancient world. Furthermore, although now she does not talk to him, at an earlier point in the story Encolpius was intimate with Tryphaena and she was happy to have him as her lover (113.8, *neque Tryphaena me alloquebatur tamquam familiarem et aliquando gratum sibi amatorem*). But this was before Giton took his place (113.7, *nec tamen adhuc sciebam utrum magis puero irascerer quod amicam [sc. Tryphaenam] mihi auferret, an amicae quod puerum corrumperet* ["I couldn't make up my mind whether to be more angry with the boy for stealing my girlfriend from me, or with the girlfriend for seducing the boy"]). It seems quite pointless to assume that she lost interest in Encolpius and fell in love with her own slave whom she would have known well before.

If the little information we have of the boys' relationship with Tryphaena is matched with the pattern which Vincenzo Ciaffi was first to point out (further discussed below) of Encolpius making friends and lovers of people who then become his enemies as soon as they take an interest in Giton, we can account for both Tryphaena's switch from Encolpius to Giton and the development from friendship to animosity. With a certain amount of plausibility we may therefore assume that Encolpius first had an affair with Tryphaena in Massalia. True to type, she would like Circe have lusted after Encolpius during that year when he was receiving gifts of food in his role as scapegoat and when the reputation of his penis would have been likely to attract the interest of the libidinous women of the town. In both the Greek and the Latin Ass stories we have a similarly needy lady who is attracted to the donkey penis only (*Asin.* 51, 56; *Met.* 10.19–22). According to the satiric ethos, wealthy and beautiful matrons like Tryphaena, Hedyle and Circe are expected to lust after sexy outcasts, slaves, gladiators and condemned criminals (*Sat.* 126.10, *matronae, quae flagellorum vestigia osculantur* ["married women, who kiss the scars of a flogging"]). Later then, when Encolpius had

been expelled, she may have run away from home with him—in the same manner as Hedyle, Ascylos and even Eumolpus, other initial friends and lovers of Encolpius who join the “brothers” on their travels, only later to become unwanted and suspected by the protagonist. An alternative (which does not necessarily exclude the first option) would be that she was found out by her husband, and thus too became a voluntary exile to escape the consequences of her infidelity, i.e., the wrath of her husband. A third possibility would be that the boys and Tryphaena met on the ship. But this seems to me less likely, since the boys typically need a third partner to help them move from one episode to another. The initial affair is certain to have been complicated, but the logic of erotic liaisons which primarily motivates the action of the *Satyrical* is relatively simple and constitutes a remarkably reliable referent for figuring out the lost parts of the plot. Only later, then, when they were on board the ship of Lichas would Tryphaena have developed her flaming passion for Giton, which so excited the rabid jealousy of Encolpius as to cause him to plan a desperate escape (108.5, 108.8, 108.14 v. 5).²⁶⁷

The voyage presumably lasted long enough for Encolpius to have had erotic relationships also with Lichas and later his wife, although a long narration is not as such an indication that a long time must have passed. However, Encolpius had at different times and in different situations been erotically involved with each of the important individuals on board the ship: Giton, Tryphaena, Lichas and Hedyle. When Tryphaena had lost interest in Encolpius and had made Giton the new object of her lust, Encolpius was free to begin the relationship with Lichas, which must have been initiated by the captain. Lichas’ wife, then, would typically have been angered at her husband’s marital infidelity, and might have used it as an excuse to do likewise.²⁶⁸ In Apuleius’ *Metamorphoses* we have the story of the *pistor* who punishes his wife’s youthful lover by taking him to bed and flogging him the day after (9.27–8), but Lichas seems genuinely to lust after Encolpius and so it is more likely that he preceded his wife as Encolpius’ lover. I suspect that Eumolpus’ ostensible fiction about the boys (supposedly his slaves) having

²⁶⁷ 113.5, *Tryphaena in gremio Gitonis posita modo implebat osculis pectus, interdum concinabat spoliatum crinibus vultum. ego maestus et impatiens foederis novi non cibum, non potionem capiebam, sed obliquis truncibusque oculis utrumque spectabam. omnia me oscula vulnerabant, omnes blanditiae, quascunque mulier libidinosa fingeat* (“Tryphaena was now lying in Giton’s lap, covering his breasts with kisses one moment, and sometimes caressing his shaven head. I was depressed and unhappy about our new treaty. I didn’t touch food or drink, but kept looking askance at them both with anger in my eyes. All their kisses wounded me, all the pleasant wiles that the libidinous woman invented.”).

²⁶⁸ Compare this to the marital row of Fortunata and Trimalchio. Note especially the reference to *ex aequo ius firmum* (74.9).

spent the night with a fictitious *amica* (105.3) may somehow in the solipsistic world of this story mirror how Hedyle was “corrupted”. The boys and Lichas’ wife seem to have made a pact against her husband, although Encolpius was primarily thinking of getting Giton away from Tryphaena. According to the central erotic pattern Hedyle would sooner or later have taken an interest in Giton and so would eventually have to be gotten rid of as well by our lovesick hero, although some variation may have been built into the motif. Something, in any case, caused them to part company for when we meet the “brothers” in the first extant scenes she has ultimately been replaced by Ascyrtos as the third man and rival. (We will leave to section 2.1.8 and 2.1.9 the discussion of the many adventures that Encolpius experienced in the long interval while he wandered about in Campania, after he escaped from the ship and before we meet him in the Greek city).

2.1.8 The *urbs Graeca*

The location where the confrontation and escape of these three characters (Encolpius, Giton, and Hedyle) took place is named in the text as *Herculis Porticus* (106.2). Julius Beloch, in his magisterial survey of ancient Campania, locates this portico in Puteoli by conjecturing that a part of the long *Säulenhallen* by the harbor, which Cicero calls *Porticus Neptuni*, may have been called *Porticus Herculis*.²⁶⁹ This is probably the strongest evidence there is to locate the place. Scholars most often assume that *Herculis Porticus* was somewhere in the complex of monumental buildings which adorned the resort at Baiae, because Tryphaena refers to having thrice seen there in a sanctuary the *simulacrum* of Neptune.²⁷⁰ Here at least we have a definite

²⁶⁹ See Beloch 1890, 134: “Die verschiedenen Theile dieser Portiken waren nach Göttern benannt. So die Porticus Neptuni, die Cicero erwähnt [*Acad. pr.* 2.25.80], nach der abbildung bei Bellori etwa zwischen dem grossen Molo und der Kirche Purificazione a mare gelegen. Ein anderer Theil dieser Säulenhallen war wohl die Porticus Herculis, von der Petron erzählt. Sie boten den Puteolanern einen beliebten Spaziergang.” Other explanations for the change from Neptune to Hercules could be poetic license or faulty memory, but inventing such arguments is too easy for them to count as evidence. The fact is that no one can positively identify the place.

²⁷⁰ The transmitted text runs like this: 104.2, *exhorruit Tryphaena et “putes” inquit “una nos dormissee; nam et mihi simulacrum Neptuni, quod Baistor asylo notaveram, videbatur dicere: ‘in nave Lichae Gitona invenies’.*” Scaliger isolated *Bais* (often written *Baiis* with Bücheler). Heinsius emended *tor asylo* to *<in> peristylo*; Gronovius to *<in> peristylilo*; Bücheler to *<in> tetrastylo*, and that reading was adopted by Ernout, Heseltine and Müller. But no *peristylum*, *peristylium*, or *tetrastyllum* has been found at Baiae (Beloch *op.cit.*, 186). However Ribezzo 1930, 57, has provided by far the best solution: “Bais ter asylo nota-

location, but nothing forces us to assume that the boys left the ship at Baiae, just because Tryphaena says she had been there. However, the *urbs Graeca* is bound to be close to Baiae. If we consider the first encounter with Quartailla, which precedes the arrival of the boys at the *urbs Graeca*, everything points to their having left the ship somewhere else than in the city of Agamemnon and Trimalchio, which they entered on foot. And Baiae does seem the appropriate setting for the corruption of a matron (Hedyle), considering its reputation as a sexually corruptive beach resort (e.g. Varr. *Men.* 44 [Astbury]; Prop. 1.11). Thanks to natural hot springs, Baiae was a fashionable spa and resort, and the emperors built palaces there, while the wealthy built their villas. For Petronius to pass by Baiae without making use of it in his licentious work would have been an uncharacteristic act of restraint, and would certainly have left his audience disappointed. However, if the boys left the ship before it reached Baiae, there wouldn't have been any episode set there, for nowhere in the preserved part of the story does Encolpius as narrator offer a narrative of things to which he hasn't been a direct witness himself.²⁷¹ We can just imagine that if the boys—and therefore the narrative as well—had left the ship before reaching the famous resort, Tryphaena's reference to having seen the effigy of Neptune at Baiae would only have inflamed the interest of the reader without satisfying the desire for knowing more about so congenial a setting for the *Satyrica*. The risk is that the reader/hearer would have seen this as a missed opportunity. It is one thing never to arrive in Tarentum, but Baiae is a different story altogether. I think it fair to assume that since Baiae is mentioned at all in the *Satyrica* it is

veram." By emending only one character, which is likewise emended by all other editors, we get a fine sense to the passage. *Asylum* is a general word for a sanctuary or a temple (and perhaps "resort", see quotation from Fronto below). The local ablative *asylo* without *in* is also possible (Verg. *Aen.* 2.761, *Iunonis asylo*, cf. Austin 1980 *ad.loc.*; Fro. *Amic.* 2.3, has *asylo recreari* but the ablative here could be instrumental), and *ter* adds an appropriately superstitious tone to Tryphaena's statement (Petronius is very fond of *ter* in this formulaic sense both in prose and verse; 88.4, 98.4, 123.1 v. 240, 131.5, 132.8 v. 1 and 2, 133.3 v. 16; the model is without doubt Verg. *Aen.* 6.229, 10.873, 11.188f.). Of some relevance here is perhaps Ribezzo's report of a "recent" underwater find at Baiae of a statue of Neptune.

²⁷¹ In this respect he differs from Achilles Tatius' Clitophon (Reardon 1994, 82), although we cannot know for certain what Encolpius did in the lost parts of the work. This argument seems to me to make Walsh's 1970, 74, "tempting" emendation of *Herculis Porticus* to *Herculis Portus*, or Monaco, lose its plausibility. Moreover, our inability to locate exactly this particular portico is surely not evidence for corruption in the text. Our modern knowledge of Campanian cities in the first century is certainly not so complete. Finally, *Herculis Portus* on its own might be misunderstood, since there was more than one place by that name, and ancient Monaco would perhaps be better referred to in full as *Herculis Monoeci portus* (v. Pauly-Wissowa s.v.).

bound to have been treated in at least one episode. After all, it is summer and the right season for Baiae.²⁷² Would Tryphaena and Hedyle, given their type, have agreed to pass by the hedonistic Baiae? We know at least that Tryphaena did not.

Now, if Beloch was right that the *Herculis Porticus* referred to is the same as the long portico by the harbor in Puteoli, the southward movement of the large vessel of Lichas would mean that it first entered the port of Puteoli with the boys still on board, for there would not be any means for a large ship like that to stop at Baiae itself. Puteoli had been the biggest commercial harbor in Campania for two centuries and it was especially furnished with a giant mole, over three hundred meters long, whose remains are still visible.²⁷³ From there the characters could have gone on foot to Baiae, which is very close. Thus the boys, by returning to the ship before the others, could have stolen the rattle and robe of the ship's effigy (113.3, 114.5) and then made their escape in the company of Hedyle, but only to be confronted by Lichas and Tryphaena in the portico of the harbor itself, in an incident from which the captain and his pretty passenger are still smarting and from which they evidently came away scathed and humiliated (106.2).²⁷⁴ After running away from Puteoli, the boys would eventually—they had many adventures in between which we shall discuss in the following section—have gone through the *Crypta Neapolitana* and so entered the Greek city of Neapolis by the normal route.

But is the *urbs Graeca* Neapolis? This equation cannot of course be proven, but it has the merits of making some sense of the otherwise confusing references in the extant text. The problem is that the Greek city is also characterized as a *colonia*, which may be taken to denote a Roman colony. Rose argued that the *urbs Graeca* could not be Neapolis because it didn't become a colony until Antonine times.²⁷⁵ But Puteoli, Rose's candidate, officially became a colony only in 63 C.E. (Tac. *Ann.* 14.27), and Hermeros

²⁷² See Rose 1962, 406–7.

²⁷³ Beloch 1890, 131: “Unterhalb des Burgfelsens und durch ihn vor dem Scirocco geschützt liegt der Hafen der Stadt, der erste an dieser ganzen Küste nach dem von Misenum. Als aber Puteoli anfang, sich zum ersten Handelsplatz Italiens aufzuschwingen, genügte dieser natürliche Schutz nicht mehr und es wurde jener Molo in's Meer geworfen, den schon das Alterthum als eins der grössten Wunderwerke pries und der noch heute von allen Ruinen Pozzuoli's unser grösstes Interesse in Anspruch nimmt.”

²⁷⁴ 106.4, *nec se [sc. dixit Tryphaena] minus grandi vexatam iniuria quam Lichas, cuius pudoris dignitas in contione proscripta sit* (“Tryphaena said that she had been just as gravely wronged as Lichas, considering that her reputation for chastity had been publicly and adversely shown up”).

²⁷⁵ Rose 1962, 404–5.

says that he came to the *colonia* as a boy (57.9, *puer capillatus in hanc coloniam veni*). Are we to imagine that the dramatic date of the *Satyrica* is that late? Are the claims of Ganymedes (44.12, 16), Hermeros (57.9), and Trimalchio (76.10) that their city is a *colonia* reliable evidence for its legal status according to Roman law? One could counter this argument by saying that they could just as well be using the Latin word *colonia* in the Greek sense, as the equivalent of ἀποικία, and in that sense Neapolis was certainly from its very foundation the *colonia* of Cumae.²⁷⁶ Loose and non-technical language would be highly characteristic of these men.

Encolpius' statement (81.3) that he is in a city with a Greek identity is intrinsically more reliable and informative than the freedmen's use of *colonia*.²⁷⁷ Now, of the three principal candidates, Cumae, Puteoli and Neapolis, only the last one could be, and was regularly, referred to as a Greek city.²⁷⁸ Neapolis happened to be the Campanian center for Greek culture, and it was known as a place which offered rhetorical and philosophical education to youth and civilized peace and quiet to retired politicians and other wealthy

²⁷⁶ Serv. Aen. 1.12, *veteres colonias ita definiunt: colonia est coetus eorum hominum, qui universi deducti sunt in locum certum aedificiis munitum, quem certo iure obtinerent: alii: colonia est quae graece ἀποικία vocatur* ("The ancients defined colonies thus: a colony is a gathering of men who together are led to a specific place to construct buildings there, which they possess by certain right. Others define it thus: *colonia* in Latin is what is called ἀποικία in Greek").

²⁷⁷ Rose 1962, 404, quotes Juvenal (3.60–61), *non possum ferre, Quirites, / Graecam urbem* ("Roman citizens, I cannot endure this Greek city"), which refers to Rome itself. But this statement of Juvenal is backed up with much context which contrasts successful Greeks in the capital itself with the poor local citizens. I do not deny that there are indications that the place is Roman, beyond the word *colonia*. As I shall explain in section 3.2.5, these are most likely Roman elements added to the description of a Greek city, during the process of adapting the *Satyrica* from a Greek model.

²⁷⁸ Tac. Ann. 15.33; Str. 5.246, 6.253; Cic. Tusc. 1.86, Arch. 5.10. The official language, even after Naples became a *municipium*, was Greek (Cic. Fam. 13.30.1, Att. 10.13.1). And the city also had a Greek calendar. On the Greek language in ancient Naples, see Leiwo 1994. Cumae, on the other hand, although a very ancient Greek settlement (Str. 5.243), was sacked in 421 B.C.E. by Campanian Samnites and became after that predominantly Oscan, while the Greek inhabitants fled to Naples, their own colony. According to Livy (40.42.13) Rome granted Cumae in 180 B.C.E. the right to use Latin as the official language at the request of the citizens themselves. As for Puteoli, its origins are obscure, but in 194 B.C.E. three hundred Roman families were settled there (Liv. 32.29, 34.45). Later, Sulla and Augustus may also have sent *coloni*, and from the second century onwards its strategic and commercial importance as the main harbor of Rome was such that its identity could not be other than Roman. Its oriental and Jewish inhabitants did not necessarily contribute to making its character Greek.

Romans.²⁷⁹ The road from Neapolis to Puteoli was lined with the villas of the great statesmen (Cicero, Pompey, Caesar, Domitian, Lucius Piso, Cato Uticensis, Lucullus). An important part of Neapolitan identity was its schools and education (Stat. *Silv.* 5.3.112), which gave to the city the by-name “learned Naples”, *docta Neapolis* (Col. 10.134; Mart. 5.78.14). Many known literary figures were citizens.

Agamemnon, accordingly, and the other *scholastici*, the pinacotheca in the temple portico, and last but not least Eumolpus the poet himself, are therefore very much at home in Neapolis. Furthermore, the lack of an *atrium* and other significant details about the house of Trimalchio show it to be Hellenistic and unlike the typical Roman houses on Campanian excavation sites.²⁸⁰ The plan of Encolpius and Ascyltos to earn a living from their knowledge of letters (10.4–6), a plan which they undoubtedly formed prior to arriving, thus seems to spring from the reputation of *docta Neapolis*, in the same manner that the conception of Eumolpus’ profitable *mimus* rises from information about the reputation of the ghost-town of Croton. Finally the similar cultural identities of Massalia and Naples with respect to Rome make this city a likely place for the fugitive Encolpius to want to seek out.

As for earlier stops in other seaports on the way from Massalia, there is no reason why we should not accept Encolpius’ statement that he was in Rome during the Saturnalia (69.9). It seems appropriate that a big commercial vessel sailing from Massalia to Tarentum would make a stop in Ostia. This was after all Rome’s main harbor for vessels coming from the west, and thanks to costly improvements it was slowly taking over the role of Rome’s biggest harbor, which Puteoli had played for two centuries.²⁸¹ Besides, it is absurd to imagine that Encolpius’ visit to Rome belongs to some other occasion than the present journey. Being a Massalio youth, he would never have left his city on any other occasion. The Saturnalia in Rome, just like Baiae, is an ideal setting for the *Satyrical*. By taking the narrative straight from Massalia to the topsy-turvy world of a Roman Saturnalia Petronius would have driven home the contrast and similarities of the two places and provided an

²⁷⁹ Str. 5.246, Hor. *Epod.* 5.43, *otiosa Neapolis*; Verg. *G.* 4.363; Ov. *Met.* 15.712, *in otia natam Parthenopem*; Stat. *Silv.* 3.5.85.

²⁸⁰ See Maiuri 1945, 244: “[L]a casa di Trimalchione [è] indubbiamente modellata più sul tipo della casa ellenistica che della casa romana. Ha un atriensis ma, in luogo dell’ *atrium*, ha, subito dopo la fauce, una *porticus* nel cui mezzo è una *piscina*, e un *hospitium* come le case di Delo.”

²⁸¹ A voyage without a stop from Ostia to Massalia was quite possible (D.C. *Hist. Rom.* 60.21.3, καὶ καταπλεύσας ἐς τὰ Ὠστια ἐκείθεν ἐς Μασσαλίαν παρεκομίσθη).

exceptional basis for the *Satyrice*'s theme of Roman, and therefore the world's, degeneration.

2.1.9 The Quartilla Episode

We now come to the beginning of the extant text, but before we proceed with our reconstruction some words must be said about the most adventurous attempt to reorganize the fragments. In 1930 the Neapolitan scholar Italo Sgobbo hypothesized that the Quartilla episode was wrongly placed in our tradition; that its proper place was before the initial encounter with Agamemnon at the school of rhetoric.²⁸² This rearrangement would make the *Cena* take over more or less directly from the initial scene in the Campanian *urbs Graeca* (Sgobbo was convinced that it was Puteoli) and thus solve the problem of the apparent lack of continuity from the invitation to dinner procured by Agamemnon (10.6) and the dinner at Trimalchio's, which he assumed were the same. The thesis involved locating the *forum* scene and the *pervigilium Priapi* in Naples. Sgobbo's thesis, however, creates more problems than it solves. The *sacrum* or *sacellum Priapi* is clearly not supposed to be in Naples, but outside the Greek city. It is referred to in a manner that shows it to be at some distance from the lodging house, where the second encounter with the priestess initially takes place (16.4, *ipsa venit*; 17.6, *huc venisse*). This distance is the distance between the Greek city and the shrine outside the *Crypta*. Puteoli and Neapolis (the strongest candidates for the *urbs Graeca*) were connected by the *Via Puteolana* and midway between them (a short walk from either city) is the *Pausilypum* promontory through which the tunnel *Crypta Neapolitana* runs.²⁸³

We need to demonstrate that the phrase in 16.3 (*Quartillae ... sacrum ante cryptam*) refers to the *Crypta Neapolitana*, for there is the possibility that *crypta* (see *OLD* s.v.) can refer to an underground room for religious rites, a vault or a crypt. However, it is not the *crypta* itself that is referred to as the shrine of Priapus. The shrine *sacrum* or the diminutive *sacellum Priapi* (16.3; 17.8, *quod in sacello Priapi vidistis*) is expressly said to be before, *ante*, the *crypta*, and so *crypta* might well be written *Crypta*. The phrase *ante*

²⁸² Sgobbo 1930, 354–61.

²⁸³ This tunnel was constructed by Cocceius, an architect of Augustus, and is often referred to in literary sources. It still exists, although many times restored and remodeled, and now measures over 700 meters. On the Neapolitan side there was a necropolis by the road and there somewhere stood Virgil's tomb. For ancient references and a map, cf. Beloch 1890, 83ff.

Cryptam is a specification of where the shrine of Priapus is located and not a reference to the shrine itself. The singular in *sacrum*, “shrine” (here only in the *Sat.*) and the alternative form *sacellum* show that *sacrum* does not denote “sacred rites” or “worship” (something which could be performed outside a shrine, if the *crypta* were the shrine itself), for which Petronius always uses the plural *sacra*.²⁸⁴

The *urbs Graeca* is on one or the other side of the important landmark *Crypta Neapolitana* and the boys came upon the cult somewhere outside the city where a *rusticus* found Encolpius’ shirt abandoned, *in solitudine*. If we add to this the observation that the word *crypta* is a rather obscure architectural term, and that it is certain that the *Crypta Neapolitana* did feature in an episode of the *Satyrica*,²⁸⁵ which must necessarily be the extant episode in the *urbs Graeca*, it seems that the phrase *ante Cryptam* is most naturally taken as a reference to the famous tunnel between Neapolis and Puteoli. Indeed, the reference in 16.3 to a *crypta* would be highly problematic, if the *Crypta Neapolitana* was not intended. Quartilla went to the city on the same side of the tunnel as her *sacellum* (cf. 17.5, *nostra regio*). Moreover, if the Greek city is Neapolis (truly the only *urbs Graeca* of the possible candidates) it would be redundant to refer to the tunnel there in full as *Crypta Neapolitana*, since it had most likely already been mentioned as such (*Fr.* XVI) and any mention of it simply as the *Crypta* would be immediately understood. The *sacellum Priapi* accordingly stood by the road before the entrance to this tunnel (whether any such place existed in reality does not matter) on the Neapolitan side.

Paratore did his best to refute Sgobbo’s thesis three years after it was first presented;²⁸⁶ nevertheless it still seemed plausible to Sullivan in 1968, who felt that “the Quartilla episode (12–26.6) [was] very much out of place”,²⁸⁷ and is still regarded by Schmeling as the leading hypothesis.²⁸⁸ In my opinion, the difficulties caused by the traditional order of the fragments have been greatly exaggerated. As I intend to show, we have not lost a day or more somewhere in the fragments. The *Cena* is supposed to take place on the second, not the third day of the boys’ stay in the *urbs Graeca*. Let us

²⁸⁴ The early commentary of Janus Souza, likewise, located the *sacrum* of Priapus before the *Crypta Neapolitana*, and identified the *urbs Graeca* as Neapolis (Burman 1743, 2: 9f).

²⁸⁵ From the glossary of Dionysius comes *Fr.* XVI, *Petronius* “*satis constaret eos nisi inclinatorum non solere transire Cryptam Neapolitanam*” (“Petronius writes: ‘So it was quite clear that they were wont to pass through the *Crypta Neapolitana* only by crouching low’”).

²⁸⁶ Paratore 1933, 1:155–158.

²⁸⁷ Sullivan 1968, 35.

²⁸⁸ Schmeling 1996a, 463, claims that the Quartilla episode (16–26) “is generally believed to be out of place and to precede the opening scene with Agamemnon.”

now go through this part of the narrative in some detail to show that it is after all quite possible to make sense of the fragments.

The encounter with Agamemnon at the school and the invitation to dinner (10.6) fall in the morning²⁸⁹ of the first day of the young men's stay in the city, which is completely new to them (6.3, *nec quod stabulum esset sciebam*; 11.1, *cum errarem*). Encolpius and Ascyltos meet Giton again at the lodging house around lunch time (9.2, *prandium*), and the invitation to dinner is scheduled that evening (10.6, *hodie*). Despite their quarrel, the boys postpone the break-up of their friendship until the day after (10.6, *cras*), so as not to be deprived of the dinner, since they are hungry (10.1, *fame morirer*) and penniless (14.3). In the afternoon (12.1, *deficiente iam die; obscuritas temporis*) they go to the *forum* hoping to sell the stolen *pallium* (12.2). By surprise they regain their lost treasure, sewn into the shirt of Encolpius, and can now at last buy something to eat. When they happily return to their lodgings Giton prepares dinner for them and they stuff themselves with food (16.1, *nos implevimus cena*). No sooner have they eaten (16.1, *ut primum*), than the woman from the market scene just before (16.3, *paulo ante*)²⁹⁰ shows up at their lodgings and identifies herself as the maid of Quartilla. Next, the priestess herself, leaving the *sacrum* or *sacellum* of Priapus, where the young men surprised her on a previous night (17.7, *nocte*; 17.9, *nocturnas religiones*), arrives at their lodgings (16.4, *ipsa venit in stabulum*; 17.6, *huc venisse*), in the same area (16.4, *suam regionem*; 17.5, *nostra regio*). At first she is polite and merely pleads with them to be silent about what happened and what they saw and to help her overcome her tertian fever according to the remedies revealed to her by Priapus in an incubational dream. But when Encolpius shows himself most ready to please her, the women's mood suddenly changes and they become threatening (18.7–19.1). Quartilla announces that she has taken control over the lodging house and is keeping out all visitors (19.2, *vetui*) for the rest of that day (19.2, *hodie*). The boys prepare to fight assuming their gender, if nothing else, will secure them victory. Something upsets their calculations (19.6).²⁹¹ Encolpius expects death, and begs for a speedy execution (20.1). Psyche spreads a mat on the floor and tries to stimulate his *inguina* to no effect (20.2). And here there seems to be a change in Quartilla's plan, perhaps because she feels that more drastic measures are needed to secure their cooperation. The boys' feet and hands are tied (20.4), and thus they are apparently carried back to the scene of the crime, to

²⁸⁹ The regular hours for school activities in the Greco-Roman world.

²⁹⁰ I retain the connecting phrase (16.3) considered by Müller to be a "gloss"; see my discussion in section 1.1.1.

²⁹¹ Most likely Quartilla's auxiliary forces: 18.5, *parata erat in crastinum turba*.

the *sacellum* of Priapus, where Quartilla lives, in the same manner that her colleague Oenothea in Croton has her home (137.3, *domicilium meum*) in the—admittedly less grand—*cella sacerdotis* (134.3) of the *templum* (136.7) of Priapus in Croton.²⁹² We note in a later reference to Pannyichis the temporal *primum*, “the first time” (25.2, *ea ipsa quae primum cum Quartilla in cellam venerat nostram*),²⁹³ which would not be needed had the company not moved from the *stabulum* to the *sacellum Priapi*. Not much needs to be missing here for describing the move to the other location, because Encolpius’ narrative transitions are usually precipitous.²⁹⁴

Suddenly, however, we are in the middle of a sympotic setting and it appears that we have missed some (erotic?) stories that were told (20.5; more on this below), and therefore a considerable amount of text may be missing in this most fragmentary part of the episode (19.6–21.3). The boys have now left the *stabulum* (16.4) or *deversorium* (19.2), which is not alluded to again in the episode. The *sacellum*, thanks to its location outside the city, would be ideal for keeping hostages for there would be no one near to hear them scream (21.1, *volebamus miseri exclamare, sed nec in auxilio erat quisquam*). Here Encolpius comes close to overdosing on the aphrodisiac *satyrion*,²⁹⁵ whose properties make Quartilla sexy in his eyes (20.7). The boys are then tortured, worked upon by a *cinaedus* and made to swear not to tell the frightful secret of the cult (21.3, *tam horribile secretum*). Next they are rubbed down by masseurs and led into the adjacent *cella* (21.5, *proximam cellam*), which is a luxurious *triclinium* (22.3, 25.3) with silverware (22.3) and a family of servants (22.2). They are treated to fine food and Falernian

²⁹² Other references to temples in Priapic sources include, *sacellum* (*Priapea* 14.2; *Appendix Verg. Pr.* 3.8), *aedicla* (*CIL* 5.3634), *templa* (*CIL* 5.2803).

²⁹³ Müller marks the clause with square brackets as an interpolation, but the text is no less sound here than in 16.3 and other similar cross-references, which are necessary to preclude confusion, when the narrative gets complicated.

²⁹⁴ One short sentence usually does the trick: 11.1, *in cellulam redii*; 12.1, *veniebamus in forum*; 15.8, *in deversorium praecipites abimus*; 82.1, *in publicum prosilio furentisque more omnes circumeo porticus*; 90.2, *subsecutus fugientem ad litus perveni*; 91.3, *raptimque in hospitium meum pervolo*; 116.1, *momento temporis in montem sudantes descendimus*.

²⁹⁵ According to Pliny (*Nat.* 26.96f., 128) the Greek word *satyrion* is a general term for plants with aphrodisiac properties. The roots or seeds of these plants have phallic shapes or resemble testicles. One type with a testicle-shaped root causes erections if taken in the milk of a farm-yard sheep, but makes erections subside if taken in water. Another type arouses sexual desire if the root is merely held in the hand, but is more potent if taken in dry wine. Yet another can stimulate if carried on one’s person. Pliny cites Theophrastus, a weighty authority in botanical matters, for the anecdote that the touch of an unspecified brand of *satyrion* provoked seventy successive copulations.

wine. When they are about to fall asleep, Quartilla reminds them that they are attending a *pervigilium* for Priapus and thus demands that they stay awake (21.7). More torture and sexual exploitation ensue and finally the whole household falls asleep out of exhaustion (22.1–3).

Syrian burglars try to steal a silver *lagoena* (large jar with handles) and unwittingly wake up the revelers. It is still night, and the butler adds more oil to the dying lamps (22.6, *tricliniarches [...] lucernis occidentibus oleum infuderat*). The party continues (23.1, *refectum est convivium*). Musical entertainment is provided by a *cymbalistris* (23.1). Quartilla invites the revelers to begin drinking again and orders a “bedclimber” (24.1, *embasicoetas*) for Encolpius, who knows this name for a specific type of drinking cup.²⁹⁶ It is a prank in many ways resembling those played by Trimalchio on his guests. Instead of a drinking cup, a *cinaedus* enters who was “obviously worthy of that house” (23.2, *et plane illa domo dignus*). This person delivers a poem in the Sotadean meter and then climbs into bed with Encolpius and tries in vain to have sex with him. When Encolpius tearfully complains about his treatment, Quartilla mocks him for his supposed lack of *urbanitas*, i.e., for not knowing that a “bedclimber” is a *cinaedus*.²⁹⁷ Encolpius now wishes that the thing be given to Ascyltos as well. At this Giton cracks up, and Quartilla seems to take an interest in him for the first time.²⁹⁸ To Encolpius’ dislike she fondles his *vasculum* and plans to have it as an erotic appetizer the day after, since she has already had something bigger that day: “This will make a good starter to rouse our desire tomorrow, since I’ve already had the donkey today, I don’t want small rations” (24.7, *belle cras in promulside libidinis nostrae militabit; hodie enim post asellum diaria non sumo*; cf. 20.7).²⁹⁹ The maid proposes to let the boy Giton *devirginare* (25.1) the young girl Pannychis, and this depraved idea is immediately put into practice. Finally, after spending most of the night at Quartilla’s, the boys some-

²⁹⁶ *embasicoetas*, (-ae) [<Gk. ἐμβασικοίτας (ἐμβαίω + κοίτη)] is an obscure Greek term for a cup (Ath. 11.469a, τὸ καλούμενον ποτήριον ἐμβασικοίταν) which according to the name seems to be intended for drinking in bed.

²⁹⁷ The *OLD* (s.v.) assumes, on the basis of the *Satyricon*, that *cinaedus* is the primary meaning, but the *TLL* (s.v.) correctly explains this sense as derived from a playful interpretation of such a strange name for a drinking cup.

²⁹⁸ When Giton first laughed (20.8), the *virguncula* was said to have put her arm around his neck and given him “numberless” kisses. Giton characteristically made no attempt to resist her amorous advances.

²⁹⁹ This apparent allusion to bestiality (*OLD* s.v. *asellus* 3) is interesting in the light of the desirability of the donkey penis in the Greek and Latin Ass-Stories. Quartilla is clearly referring to the two-legged donkey Encolpius (cf. Juv. 9.92, *alium bipedem sibi quaerit asellum*). On the topos of the desirability of large penises, see Williams 1999, 86–95.

how escape and make it to their beds at the lodging house where they spend the rest of this long and wakeful night (26.6, *abieci in lectis sine metu reliquam exegimus noctem*). They have provided the *remedium* they were asked for and thus they can put aside fear for the moment.

The mysterious third day arrives:

venerat iam tertius dies, id est expectatio liberae cenae, sed tot vulneribus confossis fuga magis placebat quam quies. itaque cum maesti deliberarem quonam genere praesentem evitarem procellam, unus servus Agamemnonis interpellavit trepidantes et ‘quid vos?’ inquit ‘nescitis, hodie apud quem fiat? Trimalchio, lautissimus homo horologium in triclinio et bucinatorem habet subornatum, ut subinde sciat quantum de vita perdiderit’. amicum ergo diligenter obliti omnium malorum, et Gitona libentissime servile officium tuentem [usque hoc] iubemus in balneum sequi. (*Sat.* 26)

Now arrived the third day, that is we were anticipating a dinner of liberty, but we were transfixed by so many wounds that escape seemed more appealing than relaxation. So when in our dejection we were discussing a stratagem to avoid the approaching storm a slave of Agamemnon’s interrupted our trepidation, and asked: “What’s wrong with you? Don’t you know at whose place it is today? His name is Trimalchio, a man of exquisite refinement, who keeps a water clock in his triclinium, and has a trumpeter ready, so that he always knows from time to time how much of his life is lost.” So forgetting all our evils we dressed with care, and asked Giton who had until now most kindly played the role of our slave to follow us to the baths.

This is where *H* begins, almost certainly because a new book began here, since it is common in long epic and prose narratives to use such temporal shifts to mark the breaks between books, and according to a fragment from the *Satyrica* preserved by Boethius such was Petronius’ practice as well.³⁰⁰

³⁰⁰ In *Fr.* V^b [Müller], taken from Boethius’ commentary on Porphyry’s *Isagoge*, we find: *et ego: “faciam” inquam “libentissime. sed quoniam iam matutinus, ut ait Petronius, sol tectis arrisit, surgamus, et si quid illud est, diligentiore postea consideratione tractabitur”* (“And I said: ‘I’ll do so very gladly. But since, as Petronius said, the morning sun has now smiled on the rooftops, let us now rise from our discussion, and if the matter deserves attention, it will be treated later with more care”). The fragment comes at the very end of a book and looks forward to a new beginning, which strongly suggests that the Petronian passage being referred to had a similar place in the original and that at least one other book of the *Satyrica* (besides the one which began with the *Cena*) had the same formulaic opening. Cf.

This is important for our present argument because it shows that the copyist who is responsible for *H*, and who we may assume was working with the complete text, did not begin with the words *Venerat iam tertius dies, id est expectatio liberae cenae* because he thought that *libera cena* referred to the dinner at Trimalchio's. He began so because the book containing the *Cena* began with those words.

As Ciaffi has explained, the *tertius dies* can only have reference to the much-feared tertian fever of Quartilla.³⁰¹ According to Celsus, tertian fever is so called because a second attack may be expected on the third day (*expectandus est dies tertius*).³⁰² It is this tertian attack which Quartilla fears, or pretends to fear (17.7, *ipsa quidem illa nocte vexata tam periculoso inhorruī frigore ut tertianae etiam impetum timeam* ["That night I myself felt uneasy and shivered from so dangerous a chill that I even feared an attack of tertian fever"]), and it is the orgiastic remedy prescribed by Priapus in a dream which provides her with a pretext for the detainment and sexual exploitation of the boys. The motif of the "love fever" as a physical sickness, of course, is too well known from other ancient novels to require specific examples. The night referred to in 17.7 (*illa nocte*) is therefore the night before the first day in the *urbs Graeca*, since by inclusive reckoning the impetus of the tertian fever would be expected to fall on the second day after the fever is first felt. This shows that we have not lost an entire day, or even more, somewhere in the fragments, as has often been assumed.³⁰³ It also shows that the *Cena*

Apul. *Met.* 2.1, *Ut primum nocte discussa sol novus diem fecit et somno simul emersus et lectulo* ("As soon as the new sun had dispelled the night and made day, I rose at once from sleep and my bed"); 3.1, *Commodum punicanibus phaleris Aurora roseum quatiens laceratum caelum inequitabat, et me securae quieti revulsum nox diei reddidit* ("Just as Aurora with her crimson disk brandished her rosy arm and began to drive her chariot across the sky, I was harshly awoken from quiet sleep as night returned me to day"); 7.1, *Ut primum tenbris abiectis dies inalbebat et candidum solis curriculum cuncta conlustrabat, quidam de numero latronum peruenit* ("As soon as darkness was dispelled with the dawn of day and the sun's bright chariot shed light on all, there was a fresh arrival"); 10.1, *Die sequenti [...]* ("The following day ...").

³⁰¹ Ciaffi 1955a, 40.

³⁰² Cels. 3.5.2, *quamvis unam accessionem secuta integritas est, tamen quia tertiana timeri potest, expectandus est dies tertius* ("although return to good health follows a single onset of fever, nevertheless, because there can be fear of tertian fever, one must wait for the third day [by inclusive reckoning]"). The eight preserved books of A. Cornelius Celsus, the encyclopedist and contemporary of Tiberius, are all on medicine and constitute the most important source for our knowledge of ancient medicine after Hippocrates.

³⁰³ Which is not to say that much text may not be lost. The whole of the *Cena*, a third of the extant work, covers only one dinner-party, and in the Quartilla episode there seems to have been entertainment over dinner in the form of erotic story-telling, chatting and/or more per-

takes place on the second day of the boys' stay in the *urbs Graeca* and not on the third day.

The boys wake up late since they are soon off to the baths. Although they have been forced to provide Quartilla with a "remedy" to counter the expected tertian attack, they do not know whether it has worked (unlikely considering the sexual nature of Quartilla's fever). Whatever *libera cena* was intended to signify, it certainly does not mean "a free dinner" or "a meal free of cost", because the Latin word *liber* did not have such modern economic connotations.³⁰⁴ More to the point would be a final dinner at Quartilla's, the dinner of their promised liberty, or a dinner which she has promised would be free of the captivity and harassment they had just suffered (26.7, *tot vulneribus confossis*; cf. 22.1 and 2, *tot malis*).³⁰⁵ We recall that Quartilla had expressed plans for enjoying Giton the day after (24.7), an intention no doubt particularly upsetting to Encolpius and enough to make him want to escape at all costs. Thus the narrator is displaying his characteristic irony by referring to the feared next encounter in Quartilla's euphemistic terms. The word *quies*, however, refers to the waiting (*expectatio*) until the *libera cena*, and not to the *cena* itself which evokes the image of stormy clouds gathering on the horizon (26.8, *praesentem procellam*). The boys themselves are now as apprehensive about the onset of the *tertiana impetus* as the priestess herself seemed, for they even deem preferable the hazards of fleeing from the

formances like the poetry delivered by the *cinaedus* (20.5, *iam deficiente fabularum contextu*; note the plural in *fabulae* and the metaphor of weaving in *contextu*, which indicate a series of stories or speeches). In similar situations at Trimalchio's, and on the ship, stories, speeches and performances are referred to as *fabulae*: 37.1, *longe accersere fabulas coepi*; 39.1, *interpellavit tam dulces fabulas*; 42.1, *excepit Seleucus fabulae partem*; 47.1, *eiusmodi fabulae vibrabant*; 59.3, *scitis quam fabulam agant*; 61.5, *talem fabulam exorsus est*; 110.6, *ne sileret sine fabulis hilaritas*; 113.1, *risu excepere fabulam nautae*. The gap between 20.4 (where the boys are tied up) and 20.5 (where the context of *fabulae* is said to have been broken) may be considerable. The presence of a gap there supports my assumption that the boys were tied up in order that they might be carried to another location and that the transition from the lodging house to the quarters of the priestess came here. Beyond the transition, the accommodation in the new location and the early part of the party are therefore missing.

³⁰⁴ Puccioni 1972, 323–26, argues differently and reads *liber=gratuitus* on the basis of *aedes liberae* (Liv. 30.17.14, 35.23.11). But as Puccioni himself acknowledges this meaning of *liber* is nowhere else attested, does not stand with *cena*, and seems to belong to an archaic diplomatic formula. For the normal idiom, cf. e.g. Apul. *Met.* 1.7, *cena grata atque gratuita*.

³⁰⁵ Trimalchio says of his slaves, whom he is promising freedom: "they will soon drink the water of liberty"—*cito aquam liberam gustabunt* (71.1). The promise of liberty is a carrot used to motivate slaves in their work. The boys' wretched fortune often makes them as vulnerable as slaves. See also *TLL*, s.v. *aqua*.

city to a much needed rest (26.7, *fuga magis placebat quam quies*). But just as their plans to go to the first dinner-party (as they had promised Agamemnon) were interrupted, they never attend this “dinner of liberty” either, because while they are gloomily deliberating (26.8, *cum maesti deliberamus*) what stratagem they can employ to shun the oncoming storm (26.8, *quonam genere* [sc. *evitandi*] *praesentem evitaremus procellam*), they are distracted by a character coming from the episode before the *pervigilium Priapi* who offers them a different kind of escape. The slave of Agamemnon seems surprised and irritated at their not knowing at whose place today’s party will be (26.9, “*quid vos*” *inquit* “*nescitis, hodie apud quem fiat?*”), and he immediately sets their thoughts and actions on to a new course, making them forget the threat from Quartilla (26.10, *amicimur ergo diligenter obliti omnium malorum*). Agamemnon seems to have sent his slave to fetch them, because they didn’t show up the day before as they had promised. The rhetorician has taken the boys under his protection. In Horatian terms they are his *umbrae* or the companions of a properly invited guest, Agamemnon himself.³⁰⁶ The word *hodie* (26.9) clearly sets Trimalchio’s dinner apart from the other dinner of the day before. From their reactions it is evident that the boys have never heard of Trimalchio before, and were not considering the possibility that Agamemnon might procure another dinner invitation so soon, which shows that even if we agree with Sgobbo in transferring the Quartilla episode, we simply cannot identify the first invitation to dinner (10.6) with the dinner at Trimalchio’s.

There may be some points in this interpretation that others would settle differently, but on the whole it shows that the episode is sufficiently intelligible. What is more important, it sits well where it is and its components require no reordering. Considering the gaps in the text and the nightmare quality of the orgy, it would be unreasonable to expect complete intelligibility of this part of the narrative.

³⁰⁶ Hor. S. 2.8.21–2, *cum Servilio Balatrone / Vibidius, quos Maecenas adduxerat umbras* (“With Servilius Baltro was Vibidius, Maecenas had brought them as shadows”); Ep. 1.5.28, *locus est et pluribus umbris* (“there was also room for many shadows”).

2.2 Retrospective Soliloquies and Dialogues

2.2.1 Retrospective Surveys in Greek Erotic Fiction

In the oldest of the extant Greek romances, those of Chariton (first century C.E.) and Achilles Tatius (second century C.E.) a common motif is the stepping aside of the hero or heroine to utter an emotionally charged statement containing a retrospective survey of fateful events thus far unfolded. In *Callirhoë*, such outbursts (mostly Callirhoë's) take the form of soliloquies, prayers and dialogues with other characters, and tend to focus on the turning points of the story (the festival of Aphrodite and the wedding, Callirhoë's *Scheintod*, the robbing of the tomb, the voyage to Ionia and her sale to the new husband).³⁰⁷ In *Leucippe and Clitophon*, most of which is a personal narrative like the *Satyrica*, this narrative figure is common as well. There the enumeration of former evils leads up to the present moment which is regarded as the definitive culmination.³⁰⁸ As a rule the recapitulations in the fully extant erotic fictions are reliable and they summarize the events that have been narrated earlier.³⁰⁹ Nevertheless, an analysis of the context of character statements necessarily forms a part of the evaluation of their usefulness for plot reconstruction.

As Richard Heinze was the first to show, the extant *Satyrica*, too, has a few such retrospective passages,³¹⁰ which were surely important in the full-text original, but have taken on added importance for us the readers of the fragments because they help us in reconstructing the story in the missing

³⁰⁷ Chariton 1.8.3–4, 1.14.5–10, 3.8.9 (prayer to Aphrodite), 3.10.4–8, 4.1.11–12, 4.3.10 (dialogue), 5.1.4–7, 5.5.2–4, 5.10.6–9, 6.2.8–11 (dialogue), 6.6.2–5, 7.5.2–5. See Hägg 1971, 262, for detailed analysis.

³⁰⁸ Ach. Tat. 3.16.3–5, 4.9.5, 5.7.8–9, 5.11.1–2, 5.25.2–8, 7.5. Hägg 1971, 283.

³⁰⁹ Heliodorus, however, lets his characters introduce red herrings to mislead other characters of the story, and even to mislead the reader. The figure is a feature of Heliodorus' *in medias res* narrative. He literally starts in the middle of the story (the striking opening scene) and only at the end of the fifth book does the reader know the events leading up to the beginning. The missing information is gradually filled in by the characters, especially by the Egyptian priest Calasiris, who, with interruptions, narrates the best part of the first half of the story (2.24 through 5.33). On his "mendacity", see Winkler 1982. There is obviously little room for this figure in chronologically linear narratives like the (extant) *Satyrica*.

³¹⁰ Heinze 1899, 514.

parts of the work. Although scholars have lately tried to minimize the significance of these retrospective allusions, there is no reason to assume that they are any less reliable in the *Satyrica* than in other ancient erotic fictions. Read carefully they indeed make good sense and complement the picture that we have already constructed on the basis of external fragments and the geography of the story. The first such passage comes early in the extant fragments and has the form of a dialogue, or more specifically a shouting-match, between Encolpius and his newly found, and soon to be lost, friend Ascyrtos. Here it is Ascyrtos, rather than Encolpius himself, who provides information about some of the hero's past crimes and humiliations. As we shall see, Ascyrtos merely knows about those recent adventures which they have experienced together.

2.2.2 The Shouting Match

The reader will recall the incident as narrated. While Encolpius had been listening to Agamemnon's poetic rendering of the ideal education, he had suddenly noticed that Ascyrtos had sneaked away. Ever fearful of rivals for the pleasures afforded by Giton he had immediately set off after his friend but had not been able to find his way back to the lodging-house, being unfamiliar with the city. Eventually, he had been tricked into a brothel by "an urbane old lady", where he by chance had run into Ascyrtos, who told him that he too had been lost but had been led to the *lupanar* by a gentleman who at first seemed helpful, but as it turned out had only wanted to hire him for sex. After escaping from the brothel Encolpius finally finds his way to the guesthouse when he glimpses Giton standing in a street. No sooner are the "brothers" reunited than Giton starts crying. Under pressure from Encolpius, he reluctantly tells of how Ascyrtos had arrived in haste a little earlier and had attempted to rape him. Hearing his worst suspicions confirmed, Encolpius is enraged and points his fingers into Ascyrtos' face demanding an explanation. Let us now print their important quarrel in full (9.6–10.3):

"quid dicis" inquam "muliebris patientiae scortum cuius ne spiritus purus est?" inhorrescere se finxit Ascyrtos, mox sublatis fortius manibus longe maiore nisu clamavit: "non taces" inquit "gladiator obscene, quem de ruina harena dimisit? non taces, nocturne percussor, qui ne tum quidem, cum fortiter faceres, cum pura muliere pugnasti, cuius eadem ratione in viridario frater fui qua nunc in deversorio puer est?" "subduxisti te" inquam "a praeceptoris colloquio." "quid ego, homo stultissime, facere de-

bui cum fame morerer? an videlicet audirem sententias, id est vitrea fracta et somniorum interpretamenta? multo me turpior es tu hercule, qui ut foris cenares poetam laudasti.”

itaque ex turpissima lite in risum diffusi pacatius ad reliqua secessimus.

“So!”—I said—“what have you to say for yourself, you prostitute, submissive as a woman, whose breath is not even pure?”—Ascyltos first pretended to be shocked, but then came on more aggressively raising his fists and yelling with considerably more vehemence: “Won’t you shut up, you filthy gladiator, whom the amphitheater dismissed when it collapsed? Won’t you shut up, you night-time assassin, who then, when you were at your strongest, weren’t even a match for a pure woman, whose brother I was in the same sense in the garden that the boy is now in the lodging-house?”—“You sneaked away from the colloquium with our instructor”—I added. “What was I supposed to do, you stupidest of all men, when I was dying of hunger? Should I perhaps have listened to his rhetoric, nothing but broken bottles and dream interpretations? By Hercules, you’re much baser than I; you flatter the poet to get an invitation to dinner.”

So out of this completely disgraceful quarrel we dissolved into laughter and backed off for a more peaceful remainder.

We can begin our analysis of the passage by noting that Encolpius appears to have concealed from Ascyltos the nature of his love relationship with Giton, perhaps as a part of some ploy to keep the other from developing designs against the boy’s chastity, but more likely because Ascyltos himself had been Encolpius’ lover in the *viridarium*, as emerges from the passage. Encolpius now demands an explanation from his friend as to why he, who before has submitted to penetration and whose breath isn’t even pure (from having engaged in *fellatio*), is now posing as a dominant male and trying to rape Giton. After having made his young self utter this accusation, the narrator then supplies the information that Ascyltos was not truly offended by the accusation, although he found it convenient at the moment to fake indignation (*inhorrescere se finxit*).

Accordingly, Ascyltos’ even louder answer does not seek to offer a defense against the assault on his virility, but instead aims to drag Encolpius down with him, and demonstrate that he is in no position to criticize, or even to speak (note the repeated “*non taces*”), since he too is seriously lacking in virility. The logic of Ascyltos’ counterattack on Encolpius’ virility is not the

accusation of impotence that some have thought (that condition comes as a great surprise to the characters as late as the Croton episode) but seems instead to appeal to a more general definition of the dominant male as someone who displays military prowess and has sex with a “pure woman”. An obvious analogy is drawn between fighting, or stabbing, and sexually penetrating. The phrase “pure woman” picks up the quality of the “pure breath”, *spiritus purus*, which is what Ascyrtos supposedly lacked. A “pure woman” seems therefore to be mainly a woman who does not engage in *fellatio*—and by implication in other “dirty” sexual activities. In principle, then, the dominant male here earns his reputation for sexual virility primarily by engaging in vaginal intercourse.³¹¹

In the sexual department, therefore, Encolpius’ dominance (“*cum fortiter faceres*”), over Ascyrtos in the *viridarium* and Giton in the *deversorium*, fail to qualify him as a dominant male, since buggery does not really register in this respect. His exploits in the military department (as an obscene gladiator rejected by the amphitheater and as a night-time assassin) are likewise found to be very much lacking in manliness. By thus applying a positive standard of virility, instead of the negative definition employed by Encolpius (“you are sexually submissive and therefore not virile”), Ascyrtos puts a different rhetorical color on the facts of the case and argues that Encolpius cannot criticize another for lacking a virtue he does not possess himself. Encolpius says no more about the issue and thus implicitly acknowledges that his case has been destroyed.

Encolpius, however, does not give up completely, and now accuses his friend of having deliberately sneaked away from their instructor. The charge is that Ascyrtos did so with the intention of catching Giton alone in the guesthouse to sexually abuse him. Ostensibly, this goes to show that he would prefer the pleasures of buggery to his own literary edification. Again Ascyrtos interrupts Encolpius before he can make an explicit case and claims a legitimate reason for leaving: he was dying of hunger. He then mounts a counter-attack and reminds Encolpius of his motives in staying to listen to Agamemnon: he was dishonestly praising bad poetry in order to earn an

³¹¹ The use of *purus* or *impurus* to denote this specific type of defilement is attested, beside the above passage, in several poems of Martial. Adams 1982, 199, provides further examples. Soverini 1976, 99–107, rightly stresses the importance of the interpretation of *purus*, but his argument is unnecessarily marred by his anachronistic insistence that the boys are accusing each other of “homosexuality”. In fact, Encolpius accuses Ascyrtos only of not being dominant, but submissive like a female whore, to the point of engaging in *fellatio*; cf. Williams 1999, 197ff. on oral sex in Roman sources. In the Roman discourse on sexuality a distinction between “homosexuality” and “heterosexuality” did not have the fundamental importance that it seems to have in modern sexual vocabulary; see Williams 1999, 4ff.

invitation to dinner. At this blow, young Encolpius is outwitted and all he can do is to laugh in embarrassment at having been seen through. Ascyrtos, who has won the argument with the help of his quick wit, joins him in the laughter.

It has been necessary to offer in some detail an explication of the crude logic of this quarrel as a preliminary to using the information it contains for the reconstruction of the story. If I am right that the phrases “gladiator obscene” and “nocturne percussor” are used by Ascyrtos to demonstrate Encolpius’ lack of military prowess, the fact that Encolpius fully accepts these examples demands that there be a factual basis behind them. The narrative, therefore, at some point told of Encolpius as some sort of gladiator, “an obscene gladiator”, who was rejected by the (*h*)arena or amphitheater in relation with its collapse (*quem de ruina harena dimisit*).

The words, *de ruina*, have unnecessarily troubled editors.³¹² The preposition, *de*, can here either have a temporal (“following from”, “after”), or a causal (“on account of”) sense.³¹³ At least one collapsed amphitheater is known from contemporary history. According to Suetonius (*Tib.* 40) twenty thousand people died in the reign of Tiberius when the amphitheater at Fidenae just north of Rome collapsed during a gladiatorial show.³¹⁴ The disaster entered the collective memory (Suet. *Cal.* 31). The gladiatorial ludus in Pompeii is known to have been destroyed in an earthquake in 62 B.C.E.³¹⁵ That Ascyrtos has knowledge of the disgraceful gladiatorial experience of Encolpius indicates that the incident belongs to that part of the story in which Ascyrtos played a part. Accordingly, the episode was set in Campania.

³¹² The *editio Tornaesiana* alone of the textual witnesses prints an asterisk between *de* and *ruina*, and Bücheler concurs with it by indicating a lacuna. Nodot had tried to improve upon the passage by supplying the words *hospitis homicidam* after *quem*; based on 81.3. Müller 1995 prints *de ruina* between daggers. Ernout, on the other hand, accepted the unproblematic text of *codex Leidensis*.

³¹³ Burriss 1941, 276, provides a defense for the Latinity of the expression: “[t]he preposition *de* is used in all periods of Latin literature in the sense “as a result of, because of.”

³¹⁴ Suet. *Tib.* 40, *supra viginti hominum milia gladiatorio munere amphitheatri ruina perierant* (“During a gladiatorial show more than twenty thousand men perished in the ruin of the amphitheater”). Bagnani 1956, 25f., connected the incident to the story of Petronius, but because he was arguing that Ascyrtos’ address of Encolpius as *gladiator obscene* was merely a general term of abuse and not a reference to a lost episode in the work, he used the association with the disaster at Fidenae to hypothesize an unattested expression of abuse, *gladiator Atilianus* (the freedman Atilius produced the show for the sake of profit and his parsimony was blamed for the accident). According to him then “[t]he general meaning of the remark of Ascyrtos would be: ‘You lousy gladiator, whose only chance of dismissal was to be engaged by such a down-at-heel contractor that his shoddy amphitheater collapsed!’”

³¹⁵ Sen. *Nat.* 6.1–3, 27.1–2; Tac. *Ann.* 15.22.

As we shall see further on there is indication that an earthquake caused the collapse of the building. Campania's reputation as a seismically active region would provide a sufficient excuse for presenting such a story, and even if no comparable incident had actually been known, it could nevertheless sound credible as the sort of thing that might well happen in that area. The Fidenae incident and the one at Pompeii had proven that such disasters could happen.

A fragment of Petronius might explain how exactly the collapse of the amphitheater caused or preceded the dismissal of Encolpius. Fulgentius in his treatise on the contents of Virgil's works makes a note of an unusual word, *aumatium*, meaning "a private place in public as in theaters or in a circus", and he goes on to quote this phrase from the original text of the *Satyrice*: "I hurled myself into the latrine."³¹⁶ Such a turn of events would have given a typically humiliating spin to Encolpius' escape from a grave danger.³¹⁷ Its particular usefulness for the plot of the *Satyrice* would be that of providing a sarcastic "happy ending" to the episode, i.e., the salvation of the hero by way of the destruction of others. This would be analogous to the escape from Lichas and Tryphaena through the wreckage of Lichas' ship and his drowning (114.6), and partly like the escape from Trimalchio when the *vigiles* break down the door of his house (78.6f.), although on that occasion casualties are not required for the boys' salvation.

We have argued above that the adjectives in the phrases, "gladiator obscene" and "nocturne percussor", have the function of degrading Encolpius' exploits in the military department. Some scholars have argued that Ascylos' language has limited or no relevance at all to the protagonist's hypothetical "criminal dossier."³¹⁸ The general tenor of these objections relies on the assumption that either the rhetorical and abusive character of the boys' quarrel, or the sexual content,³¹⁹ is so strong that it neutralizes any possible

³¹⁶ *Fr. XIII, aumatium dicitur locum secretum publicum sicut in theatris aut in circo. unde et Petronius Arbiter ait "in aumatium memet ipsum conieci"* ("aumatium means 'a privy [latrine] in a public place' as in theaters or in the circus. Wherefore Petronius Arbiter says: 'I hurled myself into the latrine'"). The word could be a corrupt Grecism for ὀμμάτιον, see *OLD* s.v.

³¹⁷ Sullivan 1968, 43, made the same association between *Fr. XIII* and the lost gladiatorial episode.

³¹⁸ The phrase is from the title of Pack 1960.

³¹⁹ Thus Mulroy 1970, 225, proposes a full-blown allegorical interpretation which is entirely sexual: "Ascylos' insults are not meant literally, but rather as a figurative description of Encolpius' sex life. This is also suggested by the adjectives, *obscene* and *nocturne*. On this interpretation, the *ruina* involved is a previous collapse of Encolpius' virility. *Gladiator* and *percussor* suggest erotic exertions. *Cum fortiter faceres* refers to past heterosexual affairs,

retrospective allusions. Gilbert Bagnani so argues that Ascyrtos is “an artist in abuse, [who] knows the force of alliteration and assonance”, and who practices mere abuse and elaborate name-calling; accordingly, “one should not inquire too closely as to the exact meaning [...] of the expressions used.”³²⁰ Walsh echoes Bagnani, when he speaks of “the scholastic nature of this exchange” and “the artificial nature of the controversy”. According to him it is all “a charade” devoid of any realistic references.³²¹ Roger Pack readily agrees with Bagnani “that *gladiator obscene* is mere abuse”, although he does not think the case is thereby closed, and rightly points out that the passages in 81.3 (they will be treated below) must be accounted for before the *prima facie* content of Ascyrtos’ phrases can be written off.³²² Recently, Gareth Schmeling has once more urged the reader “not to accept at face value that which Encolpius hands him.”³²³ We disagree because on the face of it these statements *are* retrospective allusions, and since we have lost so much text from the original *Satyrice*, it seems better in principle to assume that they do indeed refer to lost episodes—until our attempts at reconstruction clearly show that we have been misled. My findings indicate that a reconstruction according to the apparently retrospective allusions in the *Satyrice* is less problematic than has often been thought.

It remains for us to explain what exactly Ascyrtos could be referring to by calling his friend “an obscene gladiator”.³²⁴ The first idea that comes to mind is the association with Encolpius’ most significant attribute, his phallus. Lucius, the narrator of the *Metamorphoses*, while in the form of an ass

like the one with Tryphaena (113.7). The *pura mulier* represents the object of competent seduction and stands in contrast with women like Tryphaena.”

³²⁰ Bagnani 1957, 24–5. The same scholar suggests a term, “prosopographical”, for the type of invective allegedly used by Ascyrtos in the passage, and describes it as “the unflattering and usually imaginary description of the antagonist’s career.” He provides an example from Pompeian graffiti, in which the object of ridicule is first reminded of all the low professions he has practiced and still practices, and then this is topped by the following statement: “if you have licked cunt, you have tried everything”—*si cunnum linxeris, consummaris omnia* (della Corte 1954, 329). The problem with this evidence is that we do not know whether the receiver of this insult had actually done what he is accused of. For obvious reasons, insults which allude to something real, even if they put a malicious spin on the facts, are more biting.

³²¹ Walsh 1970, 87.

³²² Pack 1960, 31.

³²³ Schmeling 1994/5, 211.

³²⁴ The other phrase *nocturne percussor* I simply take to refer to a murder committed by Encolpius at night or at least in a secretive, non-virile manner. A sexual interpretation of the phrase would perhaps be possible in another context but here it would indicate that Encolpius was, contrary to what Ascyrtos is arguing, a dominant male.

and thus no less a phallic figure than Encolpius, is sent into the arena to copulate with a condemned woman (*Met.* 10.34). This Apuleian episode has its direct counterpart in the Greek Ass-Story. However, Encolpius is not a donkey and therefore cannot have afforded the spectacle of intercourse between an animal and a human being. A more likely and possible scenario may be that he was made to fight with a woman, an Amazon of the arena, and may have escaped from that encounter only because of the collapse of the amphitheater.³²⁵ Let us explore this further.

In the extant *Satyrica*, Echion, a guest at Trimalchio's dinner, in praising the upcoming *munus* given by Titus, probably that year's aedile, stresses that there will be a woman fighting from a chariot, *mulier essedaria* (45.4).³²⁶ This passage, which is the only one on the subject in the extant text, also presents a scathing criticism of the previous year's games in the amphitheater, presented by one Norbanus, and especially of the weaklings then fighting in the arena. In the Quartilla episode moreover Encolpius, Ascyrtos and Giton line up for battle with Tryphaena, Psyche and Pannychis respectively (19.4–6). Here the language and subject matter is military in a non-metaphorical sense.³²⁷ Encolpius is certainly not a soldierly type. On the contrary, he strikes other characters in his narrative as having the qualities and looks of a prostitute,³²⁸ and he was certainly no match for the soldier he met on that night of jealous rage when he intended to kill Ascyrtos and Giton (81.6–82.4). It is therefore hard to imagine that any patron of gladiatorial games would dare to present someone as unsoldierly as Encolpius to do combat with professional fighters. If, however, he was made to fight a woman gladiator, something which may have suggested the imagery of Ascyrtos' language (“*ne quidem cum fortiter faceres cum pura muliere pugnasti*”), although here the reference is to sexual intercourse rather than fighting in the literal sense, Encolpius, the delicate phallic youth, fighting a much stronger female warrior in the amphitheater would have provided good entertainment to please such audiences as Echion and his friends.

³²⁵ See Colin 1952, 315–86, for a documentation of “gladiatorial perversions”.

³²⁶ Statius reports that women and dwarfs were used as gladiators by Domitian in Rome (*Silv.* 1.6.51ff.).

³²⁷ The phrase, *contra nos, si nihil aliud, virilis sexus* (“on the other hand, if nothing else, we had at least our male gender”), especially, shows that the idea of confronting Encolpius with a gladiatorial Amazon, to further demonstrate his disqualification from the category of the dominant male, is present in the work.

³²⁸ 7.2, “*hic [sc. in lupanari]*” *inquit* “*debes habitare*” (“‘here [in the brothel],’ she said, ‘is where you should live’”); 126.1, “*quia nosti venerem tuam, superbiam captas vendisque amplexus*” (“‘Because you are aware of your sex appeal, you play hard to get, and sell your favors’”).

Admittedly the evidence concerning the exact practices of ancient gladiatorial games is limited, but as Steven Cerutti and L. Richardson have attempted to show the *Satyrica*'s reference to "obscenity" in the amphitheater may be more specific than has often been assumed. It appears that the games in the amphitheater were not all about bloody killing but "included mock fights and slapstick duels as comic relief."³²⁹ It seems that the gladiatorial schools had more than one division; beside the part where the really virile gladiators were kept, there was also an "obscene part", *pars obscena* (Sen. *Nat.* 7.31.3), for those who were deliberately chosen for their lack of *virilitas*. The so-called "Oxford Fragment" of Juvenal speaks with outrage of a certain type of men, similar to *cinaedi* (O3, *similesque cinaedis*), who are allowed to taint respectable households with obscene words and behavior (O1–2, *vivit luditque professus / obscenum*), but would more appropriately be kept separate in the gladiatorial trainer's *ludus* and in a separate *cella* in his jail (O1–13; at Juv. 6.365–366). The logic of this arrangement is hardly obscure.

It is as the opposite of this stereotype [of the virile gladiator] that we must see the *retarius tunicatus*, a mock gladiatorial figure, of equivocal sex, regularly dressed in costume of some sort, possibly usually as a woman, and matched against a *secutor* or *murmillo* in a mock gladiatorial exhibition [...] we know that there were women gladiators, and the sight of a woman got up in body armor matched against a light-armed man in drag would surely have been a spectacle the Roman crowd would have relished.³³⁰

Ordinarily, male gladiators fought almost naked, apart from wearing the *subligaculum*, which may explain the otherwise obscure reference which Encolpius makes, that beyond being of the male sex the boys' tunics were at least girt higher than the women's (19.5, *sed et praecincti certe altius eramus*) when they matched themselves with Quartilla and her maids.

The sexual innuendo traditionally associated with gladiators and mock-gladiators fits the passage in the *Satyrica* well and shows that the insulting language used by Ascyrtos would work at least as well, if not better, if there had been a previous episode involving Encolpius' participation in an actual performance in the amphitheater. In order to explain the complicated insults exchanged between Encolpius and Ascyrtos it is therefore not necessary for us to assume that the language is factually meaningless, i.e., a mere embel-

³²⁹ Cerutti and Richardson 1989, 589.

³³⁰ Cerutti and Richardson 1989, 593.

ishment of style. In fact, insults in general are clearly more to the point if there is some real or apparently real reference behind them. If Encolpius had actually been an obscene gladiator in the arena, as Ascyrtos says he had, reminding him of that fact would be a very useful way to silence him after his accusation. Even Schmeling, though the uncompromising premise of his article is that all retrospective allusions in the extant *Satyrice* must be mere embellishments of language and Ascyrtos' words here must be empty invective, reluctantly concedes the possibility that "in a small town [...] Encolpius had acted out the part of a *gladiator*—whether in a private house, garden, or small *harena*."³³¹ In order to deal with the actual meaning of the phrases "nocturne percussor" and "viridarium", it will be necessary to introduce another important passage, this time a genuine soliloquy, in which scholars have generally recognized similarities to the phrases so far discussed.

2.2.3 Encolpius' Soliloquy

Let us first briefly rehearse the context. After two difficult nights in a row (the pervigilium with Quartilla and the dinner with Trimalchio), Encolpius finally had Giton all for himself, but he had been too drunk to accomplish more than kisses and soon fell asleep (79.8–9). While he was sleeping, Ascyrtos had taken Giton away from him and carried him off into his own cubicle. When Encolpius woke up and discovered the truth, he had first considered killing both of them, but then decided against this violent plan and merely roused Giton with a beating and demanded Ascyrtos' immediate departure. Already two days before he had wanted to break up the friendship with Ascyrtos in order to re-establish his old sexual relationship with Giton.³³² Ascyrtos now agreed to leave and they had divided their spoils without mistrust, but when it came to the boy Ascyrtos demanded that they split him as well. Encolpius first thought he was joking, but when Ascyrtos drew his sword and threatened to cut off his part of Giton he prepared to meet him in battle. Giton, however, by pleading with them and blaming himself for all that had happened, succeeded in averting this imminent "Theban tragedy". Next, Ascyrtos had suggested they solve the crisis by allowing the boy him-

³³¹ Schmeling 1994/5, 215. I fail to see, however, on what evidence Schmeling can claim that both the town and the *harena* were "small".

³³² 10.7, *hanc tam praecipitem divisionem libido faciebat; iam dudum enim amoliri cupiebam custodem molestum, ut veterem cum Gitone meo rationem reducerem* ("It was lust that caused this very hurried separation; I had been eager for some time to get rid of this annoying custodian, so that I could resume the old relationship with my Giton").

self to choose whom to follow. Encolpius agreed, trusting that his old relationship with Giton would weigh heavily in the boy's decision. Without even giving the matter much thought, Giton had chosen Ascyrtos and left with him. Thunderstruck and abandoned by his two friends and lovers, Encolpius collected his baggage and rented "a secret place by the shore", where he locked himself in and "frequently lamented" in this manner (81.3–6):

"ergo me non ruina terra potuit haurire? non iratum etiam innocentibus mare? effugi iudicium, harenae imposui, hospitem occidi, ut inter audaciae nomina mendicus, exul, in deversorio Graecae urbis iacerem desertus? et quis hanc mihi solitudinem imposuit? adolescens omni libidine impurus et sua quoque confessione dignus exilio, stupro liber, stupro ingenuus, cuius anni ad tesseram venierunt, quem tamquam puellam conducit etiam qui virum putavit. quid ille alter? qui tamquam die togae virilis stolam sumpsit, qui ne vir esset a matre persuasus est, qui opus muliebri in ergastulo fecit, qui postquam conturbavit et libidinis suae solum vertit, reliquit veteris amicitiae nomen et, pro pudor, tamquam mulier secutuleia unius noctis tactu omnia vendidit. iacent nunc amatores obligati noctibus totis, et forsitan mutuis libidinibus attriti derident solitudinem meam. sed non impune. nam aut vir ego liberque non sum, aut noxio sanguine parentabo iniuriae meae."

"So why couldn't the earth swallow me in the collapse, or the sea for that matter, who gets angry even with innocent people? Have I escaped trial, have I cheated the amphitheater, have I killed my host, so as to lie amid suspicions of delinquency,³³³ poor as a beggar, an exile abandoned in the lodging-house of a Greek city? And who imposed on me this solitude? An adolescent, defiled by every sort of libidinous act and according to his own confession worthy of exile; freedman through buggery, freeborn through buggery, whose youth is for sale at the toss of a coin, who was hired as a girl even by the man who knew him for a guy. And what about that other one? who put on a woman's dress as if on the day of assuming a man's toga, who was persuaded by his mother that he wasn't a man, who took on a female function in the jailhouse; who after having reshuffled and shifted his sexual ground, betrayed the name of old friendship, and—the shame of it—like a following girl traded all his assets for one night of groping. Now the lovers lie entire nights locked in each other's

³³³ The word *nomen* here means "suspicion" or "ground of accusation, complaint"; cf. Cic. *de Orat.* 1.120, *impudentiae nomen*; *Fam.* 2.1.1, *nomine neglegentiae*; Suet. *Tib.* 3.2, *levitatis nomine*.

embraces, and maybe, when they are worn out from their mutual satisfaction, they mock my solitude. But not with impunity! For I'm not a man and a freeborn citizen, if I don't avenge these insults by spilling the guilty blood."

In this passage the same underlying erotic considerations as before are easily recognizable. Although not named, we must take Ascylytos to be the first one mentioned and Giton the second. Ascylytos' defilement through impure sexual acts, especially *fellatio*, was the topic of the earlier passage as well, and he is again here described as a male prostitute. It is now Giton who is the "female" in the *ergastulum*, "the private jail", whereas earlier it was Ascylytos who submitted to Encolpius in the *viridarium*, "the garden", although his sexual passivity was then likened to that of Giton in the *deversorium*, "the lodging house". The first two places mentioned, the *ergastulum* and the *viridarium*, are most likely related. As we shall see further on, both probably refer to the villa of cruel Lycurgus,³³⁴ which is the kind of place, a villa, which we would typically find in Campania, and where we could easily find both a garden and a private jail all in one. Giton and Encolpius go a long way back together ("*veteris amicitiae nomen*"), whereas Ascylytos is a rival who has recently entered the picture, and now has temporarily managed to abduct the boy from the sorry protagonist. This erotic melodrama between the three boys exhibits few mysteries that are not readily understood.

The initial death wish, however, has caused much speculation which directly impinges upon how much material for reconstructing lost episodes can be extracted from the passage. Here again scholars have argued that the form somehow overpowers and cancels out some of the content. Ever since Otto included the opening sentence of Encolpius' remorseful soliloquy ("*ergo me non ruina terra potuit haurire?*") in his collection of Roman *Sprichwörter*,³³⁵ the phrase has passed for "a more or less stereotyped expression."³³⁶ From this it has been thought to follow that the words, *ruina* and *terra*, ought not be connected with the words *de ruina harena* (9.8) in

³³⁴ 83.6, "*at ego in societatem recepi hospitem [sc. Ascylyton] Lycurgo crudeliorem*" ("I, on the other hand, took into my companionship a friend [Ascylytos] more cruel than Lycurgus"); 117.3, *placere vestis, rapinae comes, et quicquid Lycurgi villa grassantibus prae-buisset* ("so long as the garment, my associate in the robbery, was good for it, and whatever the villa of Lycurgus had yielded when we broke into it").

³³⁵ Otto 1890, 345, s.v. *terra* (3).

³³⁶ The quoted words are Bagnani's 1956, 25. Klebs 1889, 626, however, was writing too early to be influenced by Otto's work. Paratore 1933, 1:148, consequently accuses him of being naive in interpreting the phrase "*ergo me non ruina terra potuit haurire?*" as a reference to a lost episode.

Ascylos' earlier statement: "you obscene gladiator, whom the amphitheater dismissed when it collapsed" (9.8, "*gladiator obscene, quem de ruina harena dimisit*"), despite the reappearance of (*h*)arena only ten words later, in "*harenae imposui*" ("I have cheated the amphitheater"), where the reference, even according to Bagnani, is "clearly autobiographical."³³⁷ However, to include the supposed stock-phrase in his collection, Otto was forced to separate it from its parallel phrase which is syntactically dependent upon it: "*non iratum etiam innocentibus mare* [sc. me potuit haurire?]" The reason why Otto did not include the whole expression is, of course, that no stock phrase is attested for the latter half—nor is any for the first half, as we shall see.

A close parallel for the latter half is found in Achilles Tatius, likewise in a soliloquy of the younger self of the narrator Clitophon (3.10.6):

“μάτην σοι, ὦ θάλασσα, τὴν χάριν ὁμολογήσαμεν· μέμφομαί σου τῇ φιλανθρωπίᾳ· χρηστοτέρα γέγονας πρὸς οὓς ἀπέκτεινας, ἡμᾶς δὲ σώσασα μᾶλλον ἀπέκτεινας. ἐφθόνησας ἡμῖν ἀληστεύτοις ἀποθανεῖν.”

“O sea, foolishly did we thank you for your mercy. Now I have only blame for your philanthropy; more useful were you to those you killed, for by saving us you have killed us twice over. You meanly refused us our death, and saved us for bandits to kill.”

The reference here is to a specific voyage which ended in shipwreck. In fact, in the case of the *Satyrica*, too, scholars have not doubted that a specific voyage from a lost part of the work was referred to. We are, nevertheless, asked to believe that in Encolpius' opening sentences he first expresses (in a rhetorical question) the wish that he had been swallowed up by the earth in a collapse—without reference to any specific incident—and then refers to a specific incident on sea in a parallel phrase using the same grammatical construction. This seems like an overly complicated explanation.

If we take a better look at the “stock phrase” of Otto, whose origins are traced to Homer,³³⁸ we note that it consists of a wish for a supernatural removal of the hero from the face of the earth before he should accept doing something cowardly or shameful, and is something of a fixture in the pep-

³³⁷ Bagnani 1956, 25. He accordingly concedes “a condemnation to the arena”, but then hurries to add that Encolpius “was never condemned to the arena, though he would have been had he not made his escape.”

³³⁸ *Il.* 4.182, τότε μοι χάνοι εὐρεῖα χθών (“then let the broad earth gape for me”); 17.416, ἀλλ’ αὐτοῦ γαῖα μέλαινα πᾶσι χάνοι (“nay, even here let the black earth gape for us all”).

talk of epic warriors before a deadly confrontation. Being a wish, Homeric Greek uses the optative and the reference is always to the near future. In Latin, Otto quotes as the prime example of the epic phrase the words spoken by queen Dido to her sister Anna: “I would sooner pray that the earth would gape to its depths” (Verg. *Aen.* 4.24, *tellus optem prius ima dehiscat*). The other Latin examples provide several variations, but none deviates from the basic wish for a supernatural intervention before some disgrace happens in the future—except the Petronian passage.³³⁹ For what Encolpius says is not that he wishes for the earth to swallow him before he does something disgraceful, but that he wishes that the earth *had* swallowed him *in the collapse* instead of saving him for further disasters. The meaning is quite different. We are therefore entitled to wonder whether Otto was justified in including Encolpius’ wish that he had not been saved at some time in the past as an example of this epic stock-phrase. Schmeling adduces Giton’s words at 98.9, *utinam me solum inimicus ignis hauriret vel hibernum invaderet mare*—“I wish some terrible fire would burn me up, just me, or some freezing sea would cover me”, as a parallel to Encolpius’ words at 81.3, and adds that van Thiel called such phrases “stereotype rhetorische Fragen”, but neither statement is a rhetorical question, and the more typical future optative mode of Giton’s words obviously contrasts with the past perfect tense of Encolpius’ statement.³⁴⁰

At issue here is not young Encolpius’ heroic sense of shame—he is for the most part shameless—but, as in the Achilles Tatius passage above, the pointlessness of his past salvation in the light of his continued misfortune. Unlike the other examples of the stock-phrase this one poses the question: when, exactly, was there a particularly opportune moment in the past narrative of Encolpius for him to be “swallowed up by the earth in the collapse”? We, of course, know when he could have been swallowed up by the sea; this was on his earlier voyage on the ship of Lichas, a character who is later in fact swallowed up by the sea. A past incident involving a collapsing amphitheater would certainly provide us with a specific moment to serve as a parallel for the other element. How else are we to account for the mysterious word *ruina*? To wish that “the earth swallow one up in the collapse” is hardly a formulaic turn of phrase.³⁴¹ There may well be in Encolpius’ words a play on

³³⁹ Otto lists one other occurrence in the past tense (Ov. *Ep.* 6.144, “*hiscere nempe tibi terra roganda fuit*”), but in the passage Hypsipyle is addressing Jason and recalling a specific moment in the past when he ought to have wished for the earth to swallow him.

³⁴⁰ Schmeling 1994/5, 218.

³⁴¹ Bagnani 1956, 25, claims that “*ruina terra haurire* is a more or less stereotyped expression equivalent to our own ‘would the earth had swallowed me up’”, but this modern English id-

the epic cliché, but the resemblance is no more than superficial, and the adaptation of the collapsing amphitheater to the paradigm of the gaping earth is certainly forced.³⁴²

Haurire seems a singularly inappropriate substitute for the Virgilian *dehiscere*, and is obviously better suited to *mare* in the latter half of the sentence than *terra*. Since Ascyrtos is supposed to know about the gladiatorial adventure of Encolpius and the collapsing amphitheater, this episode must necessarily have come after the earlier voyage(s) on the ship of Lichas, since Ascyrtos was not on the ship and so was introduced into the story after the first voyage(s) and before the last one. Therefore we can conclude that in Encolpius' soliloquy the collapse of the amphitheater in an earthquake, and the storm at sea, appear in an inverse temporal sequence. This may be due to a deliberate affectation of a similarity with the epic cliché. In this order Encolpius can start with something which has a superficial resemblance with the stock phrase. But more likely the inverse temporal order is caused by the fact that the latter statement is a *correctio* of the first, a sort of afterthought: "or the sea for that matter, who gets angry even with innocent people?" I can see no reason to preclude the possibility that these retrospective statements concern episodes not found in the extant fragmented text of the *Satyrica*.

In the light of his present abandonment, Encolpius muses that his two miraculous salvations from the brink of disaster, first on sea and then on land, have been completely in vain. But he also lists two more narrow escapes and one murder that have ultimately brought him nothing but loneliness and excommunication. In a rhetorical question he asks: "Have I escaped trial, have I cheated the amphitheater, have I killed my host, so as to lie amid suspicions of delinquency, poor as a beggar, an exile abandoned in the lodging-house of a Greek city?" The answer required by this rhetorical question is, of course, negative. Moreover, since the opposite of being left alone by Ascyrtos and Giton—this is what provokes the state he is in and is emphasized in the passage—is being *with* Ascyrtos and Giton, Encolpius seems to be claiming that the impudent acts he has committed were motivated by a desire to be in their company. We know that he has been trying to get rid of

iom, which I have been told does indeed exist, is hardly reliable evidence for Latin usage in the first century C.E.

³⁴² I have found no examples of *ruina* used with *terra* to denote the gaping of the earth, as in the epic stock-phrase. *Ruina* properly denotes "fall" or "collapse" and is most common in references to collapsing buildings and ruined cities: *Sat.* 115.16, *illum diis vota reddentem penatium suorum ruina sepelit* ("A man paying his vows to the gods is buried in the collapse of the building housing his ancestral gods"); *Suet. Tib.* 40, *supra viginti hominum milia gladiatorio munere amphitheatri ruina perierant* ("During a gladiatorial show more than twenty thousand men perished in the ruin of the amphitheater").

Ascyltos to be alone with Giton, and so it is not the loss of Ascyltos which is bothering him, but the loss of Giton, his old passion, who has motivated all the deeds listed by Encolpius.

This interpretation is less forced than Mulroy's, who answers the question: "Did I escape judgment, cheat the arena, murder my host, so as to lie with a reputation for audacity, a beggar, an exile, deserted in an inn in a Greek city?", thus: "No, I have committed no such crimes. I am the innocent victim of unrequited love."³⁴³ Mulroy identifies correctly that Encolpius is primarily blaming Giton for what he has gone through. As the "victim of unrequited love" he may have some excuse, but this certainly does not show that he didn't do what he indeed claims to have done. The general thrust of Encolpius' story is his desire to have Giton all for himself. In so doing he has indirectly exiled himself from his city, won enemies, and accumulated a "criminal dossier". When the boy then chooses of his own accord to leave him for Ascyltos, Encolpius is left to face the consequences of his actions and the enormity of his many-faceted isolation.

If we find it difficult to believe Encolpius capable of killing somebody, we should remember that he ends this very soliloquy by deciding to kill both Giton and Ascyltos, which is the second time he entertains the idea (cf. 79.10). Encolpius' character certainly has the necessary violent streak, as is evidenced for example in the scene where he takes pleasure in watching Eumolpus being beaten up by cooks and lodgers while he himself strikes Giton a blow on the head for wanting to open the door to rescue him (96.1–4). That the comic plot of the *Satyrice* would allow someone to actually die is clear from Lichas' death at sea, while he pleads with Encolpius to return the sacred objects that he had stolen (114.5–6). On the whole, the law of the genre is not at all averse to killing off minor characters, especially those who pose obstacles to the uniting of the lovers, and could otherwise obstruct the continuation of the adventurous plot. The fully extant ancient erotic fictions are replete with violence and death. Moreover, as we have seen from the story of Hippothous and other examples (e.g., Thuc. 6.45; Parthenios 7), actually assassinating one's rival—and not just fantasizing about it—seems to be a well known motif in ancient erotic tales of two boys in love.

2.2.4 Remapping the Plot

We now need to connect our findings here with our previous geographical re-mapping of the plot of the *Satyrice* to establish where exactly on the route

³⁴³ Mulroy 1970, 255.

south it was that Encolpius played the gladiator, escaped trial, and killed his host. According to the fragment of Servius (*Fr.* I), Encolpius was exiled, not for any crime committed by him, but because he volunteered to play the scapegoat in return for being fed for a whole year at public expense. He seems therefore to have boarded the ship simply as a humiliated exile and as such was merely *en route* to a new city where he could take up habitation, most likely in Tarentum, the final destination of Lichas' ship. But Tryphaena's monopoly of Giton becomes intolerable to him, and so he impulsively decides to flee from the ship. As we have seen earlier this is most likely to have been in a harbor somewhere south of Baiae and north of Neapolis, since Tryphaena mentions Baiae in connection with the boys' escape (104.2), and because the boys are thunderstruck at discovering that in Neapolis they have again boarded Lichas' ship (100.3ff.), which therefore cannot be the same city where they left it.³⁴⁴ Since Puteoli had a big harbor, came earlier on the route from Massalia than Neapolis, but later than Baiae, and was close enough to Neapolis for the boys to have moved on foot, this is probably where the boys ran away. Let us assume so, in any case, to see whether the reconstruction will continue to make sense if we base it on these premises. After all we are engaged in assembling something like a jigsaw puzzle, and success is measured by how many pieces find a comfortable and unforced place in the picture. The only premise that we can rely on with absolute certainty is that the pieces fit in somehow and that once there was a clear and ordered picture.

After fleeing from the ship of Lichas in the harbor of Puteoli in the company of Giton and the captain's wife, and after stealing the robe and sistrum of the ship's tutelary deity, Isis, Encolpius finds himself, in addition to being an exile, a fugitive with his enemies chasing after him. In his efforts to get Giton away from Tryphaena, and in order to provide for the boy and himself on the run, he has embarked on a career of petty criminality by robbing the shrine on the ship. More than just theft, this was technically also sacrilege. On the whole, Encolpius is involved in the theft of no less than three garments, which need to be kept carefully separated. The first is the "the robe of the goddess", *vestis divina* (114.5), from the *navigium* of Lichas, the second is the "small tunic full of gold coins", *tunicula ... aureis plena* (13.3), which is the same as "the garment, my associate in the robbery", *vestis rapinae comes* (117.3), with the money stolen from the "villa of Lycurgus", *Lycurgi*

³⁴⁴ Before Puteoli began to play an important commercial role, Naples had functioned as the main harbor of Campania and the city even had its own fleet (Polyb. 1.20.14, Liv. 35.16, 36.42, Appian. *bell.civ.* 1.89). There is, in other words, no evidence to preclude the docking of the ship of Lichas in Neapolis as well as Puteoli.

villa (117.3), who seems to have been a miser who sewed his money into his shirt.³⁴⁵ The third is the “stolen cloak”, *raptum latrocinio pallium* (12.2), taken from the “shrine of Priapus”, *sacellum Priapi* (17.8), presided over by Quartilla. Two are expensive on their own account and one is a rag containing hidden valuables.

Once off the ship, Encolpius and Giton do not seem to have gotten far in their flight. Their apprehension is alluded to in Tryphaena’s conjecture, when she asks *quid ergastulum interceptisset errantes*—“what jailhouse had intercepted the fugitives on their flight” (105.11). Although the character Tryphaena is not supposed to know at this point what really happened, she nevertheless arrives at the truth from false premises (she believes that the painted letters on the boys’ foreheads are truly branded marks), for we know from a previous passage that Encolpius and Giton have in the meantime been, indeed, in an *ergastulum* (81.5). Such felicitous guesses by characters are possible for the simple reason that what is told in the story and how it is told is entirely controlled by the narrator. The central story pattern also requires that soon after Encolpius escaped from Lichas and Tryphaena he should fall into new captivity.

Perhaps Encolpius was caught trying to sell the *vestis divina* and the *sistrum* of Isis, in the same way that he and Ascyrtos are later caught trying to sell the Priapic *pallium*, in a shady forum of the *urbs Graeca*. Somehow or other the stolen objects seem to have been discovered in the possession of the boys. In the name of divine retribution, it would seem that objects stolen from shrines and temples should normally lead to the capture of the thieves.³⁴⁶ Fragment XII, *tot regum manubies penes fugitivum repertae*—“so many regal spoils discovered in the possession of escapees,” may well refer to this. The word *manubies*, or *manubiae*, which caught the eye of Fulgentius, and so led to the preservation of Fragment XII, is, indeed, used by Encolpius for the spoils that he and Ascyrtos in good faith divide between themselves when they part company (79.12, *optima fide partiti manubias sumus*). When Encolpius again boards the ship of Lichas, the captain at least

³⁴⁵ 117.3, *quicquid exigeret, dummodo placeret vestis, rapinae comes, et quicquid Lycurgi villa grassantibus praebuisset* (“whatever he asked for, so long as the garment, my associate in the robbery, was good for it, and whatever the villa of Lycurgus had yielded when we broke into it”). One may wonder how it survived the shipwreck, but this may be asking for too much verisimilitude from this adventurous plot. Encolpius has at least not complained of poverty since he recovered the shirt with the golden coins in the market scene, and although Ascyrtos would presumably have received half, there could still be enough left to give Eumolpus the appearance of affluence.

³⁴⁶ In Apuleus, *Met.* 9.10, the priests of the Syrian goddess are captured as well.

seems to think that the boy still possesses the objects he stole from the ship.³⁴⁷

Foremost in Encolpius' enumeration of his exploits, which we may take to be in a temporal sequence,³⁴⁸ comes his escape from trial (81.3, *effugi iudicium*). The hyperbolic and accusatory style of Fragment XII leads us to think that these may be the words of Encolpius' prosecutor at this trial. The obvious exaggeration in the phrase "so many regal spoils" seems to be designed for the sake of rhetorical effect. The name of the prosecutor may even be provided by another of Fulgentius' fragments of the *Satyrica*. According to Fragment VIII, a ridiculing turn of phrase was used by the narrator about a certain advocate named Euscion, who "was a Cerberus of the courts"—*Cerberus forensis erat causicus*.³⁴⁹ Not only does the barking of Euscion's accusatory rhetoric justify the comparison to the hellish dog, Encolpius also finds himself on the Campanian coast, in the area of Cumae, the Sibyl, and lake Avernus, where the entrance to the underworld was supposedly located. Likewise, in the dinner at Trimalchio's scholars have noted signs that the episode was intended as an allegorical journey to the underworld.³⁵⁰ The court case Encolpius had to face was probably similar to the one threatened by the *advocati* in the market-scene in the extant *Satyrica*, i.e., Encolpius was under "suspicion of theft", *latrocinii suspicio* (15.3).

We do not think that Fragment XIV³⁵¹ belongs to this trial. The charge of *dolus malus* is different from a straightforward accusation of theft. It is hard

³⁴⁷ 114.4–5, *Lichas trepidans ad me supinas porrigit manus et "tu" inquit "Encolpi, succurre periclitantibus, id est vestem illam divinam et sistrumque redde navigio"* ("Lichas trembled and stretched out his hands to me imploringly, and said, 'Help us in our peril, Encolpius, return the divine robe and rattle to the ship'").

³⁴⁸ The sequence is the same in 9.9, "*non taces" inquit "gladiator obscene, quem de ruina harena dimisit? non taces, nocturne percussor*," and 81.3, *effugi iudicium, harena imposui, hospitem occidi*. As a rule such enumerations in ancient erotic fiction follow the sequence in which events have taken place. A similar enumeration in Chariton (first or second century C.E.) follows the correct temporal sequence (5.5: "I have died and been buried; I have been stolen from my tomb; I have been sold into slavery—and now, Fortune, on top of that I find myself on trial!" [Translation by Reardon, 1989]). I have explained above why Encolpius may have inverted the sequence of the voyage and the earthquake either in order to begin with the earthquake and so adapt his past to the needs of the epic stock-phrase, or more likely because he corrects himself to add the earlier event to the later.

³⁴⁹ Fulg. *Expos. Virg. Cont.* 98f. Fulgentius, in fact, assigns the words to Petronius, but as we have seen it is common for commentators and later writers to refer to the fictional narrator of personal recollections as if he were the same as the author.

³⁵⁰ E.g., Bodel 1994.

³⁵¹ Isid. *Etym.* 5.26.7, *dolus est mentis calliditas, ab eo quod deludat: aliud enim agit, et aliud simulat. Petronius aliter existimat dicens "quid est, iudices, dolus? nimirum ubi aliquid fac-*

to see how Encolpius, whose *simplicitas* makes him an ideal victim of fraud, could be charged with *dolus malus*, and even harder to see him twisting the meaning of legal terms as is done by the speaker of Fragment XIV. Nevertheless, Isidore does assign the utterance to Petronius and so it would be consistent with our previous readings to reassign them to Encolpius. But it is exceedingly difficult to see how they could be appropriate here to the person of Encolpius. It is Eumolpus who is the master of fraudulent schemes. He interprets the accusation of Encolpius, that he deliberately led the boys back to their enemies, as that of *dolus malus* (101.3) and the *mimus* he concocts against the legacy-hunters of Croton is a classic example of fraud.³⁵² It is therefore more plausible to assign this fragment to a missing phrase from the extant episode on the ship or to a court case in Croton brought against Eumolpus by Gorgias, whose name makes him an ideal player in a trial scene. But I admit that this is a less than perfect solution.

How did Encolpius escape from being found guilty of the charges brought against him by Euscion? We know that he did, because he tells us that he escaped the trial, *effugi iudicium*. According to his elegiac exposition of the nature of contemporary justice (14.2), all juries are venal. Who bribed the jury and why? Surely the boys did not have the means to do that, not even with the “regal spoils” that were discovered in their possession and must have been confiscated. Their only asset, apart from their knowledge of letters, is usually their sex appeal. Scholarship can procure them dinner invitations (10.4–6), but cannot motivate men of means to undertake great expenditure on their behalf (83.7–84.3). In the world of the *Satyrical* the sexual asset, however, seems to justify great expenditure by wealthy men. This is evident from the career of Trimalchio, who was his master’s favorite sex-slave before inheriting his property (75.11–76.2). If we consider Lichas’ sexual attraction to Encolpius, the eagerness of the *pater familias* to pay cash for having sex with Ascylltos in the *lupanar*-scene (8.2–4), and the ease with which he finds a savior in the infamous *eques Romanus*, when he is left without clothes at the baths (92.10), there is nothing to stop us from assuming that another gentleman of a similar stature was motivated by the same desire. In the *Satyrical* men and women alike are consistent and predictable in

tum est quod legi dolet. habetis dolum, accipite nunc malum” (“*dolus* means a deceiver’s mental craftiness, derived from the fact that he *deludat* (deceives), for he does one thing while pretending to do another. Petronius thinks otherwise when he says: ‘Judges, what does *dolus* mean? Of course it is some deed that hurts (*dolet*) the law. There you have *dolus*; now listen to what *malum* means ...’”).

³⁵² To give false information about one’s possessions in order to establish false credit is a prime example of what the legal literature intends with the term *dolus malus* (*dig.* 4.3).

their vices. A prime candidate for this role is cruel Lycurgus, who is listed as the main rival for Giton's love next before Ascyrtos (83.6), and so belongs to this part of the story, and whose *villa* (117.3), which at some point was burglarized by the boys, as we have mentioned before, would fit exceptionally well in an episode set in Campania.

According to the pattern established by Vincenzo Ciaffi,³⁵³ Encolpius' escape from one captivity is usually mediated by the appearance on the scene of a good helper who no sooner than the escape has been accomplished turns into a new menace, when he or she takes an interest in Giton. It is therefore likely that Lycurgus himself saved Encolpius and Giton from justice by bribing the jury, or by somehow or other exerting undue influence upon justice. His reasons can have been either sexual interest in the boys, or possibly a more financially motivated desire to acquire cheap labor for his villa. An unexpected verdict of innocence, after a trial where Encolpius' guilt was definitively established by the hostile Euscion, would have been in the right spirit. When Ascyrtos laments that no one knows them in the Greek city and that therefore they cannot expect to win a court case, it is likely that his speculations about their situation are directly influenced by the experience of the first trial narrated, although Ascyrtos does not seem to have entered the story until later.³⁵⁴ It seems likely, however, that Ascyrtos underwent a similar experience before or after Encolpius, that he too was a petty criminal saved from justice by Lycurgus. Encolpius' remarks about the similarity of their fortune would thus be justified (80.8).

Whatever happened in detail, it is likely that the appearance of Lycurgus indirectly resolved the trial episode by simply opening an escape route for Encolpius. The boys would now have followed their apparent savior to his villa. Such a villa would, as we have said, typically have been found in Campania. This is after all the part of Italy where wealthy Romans preferred to build their sumptuous Hellenistic palaces modestly called *villae*. Besides, as we have also seen, Lycurgus immediately precedes Ascyrtos in the remarkably orderly succession of rivals for the possession of Giton.³⁵⁵ This indicates that the place where Encolpius and Ascyrtos met and had their initial erotic experience, the garden, *viridarium* (9.9), or the chain-gang or private jail,

³⁵³ Ciaffi 1955a, 65.

³⁵⁴ 14.1, *contra Ascyrtos leges timebat et "quis" aiebat "hoc loco nos novit aut quis habebit dicentibus fidem?"* ("Ascyrtos on the other hand feared the law and said 'Who in this place knows us, or who will take our words for anything?').

³⁵⁵ 83.6, *"at ego in societatem recepi hospitem [sc. Ascyrtos] Lycurgo crudeliorem"* ("I, on the other hand, took into my companionship a friend [Ascyrtos] more cruel than Lycurgus").

ergastulum (81.5), is indeed the same as the villa of Lycurgus. In accordance with Ciaffi's model, and on the analogy of Eumolpus' role in the escape from Ascyrtos and the Greek city,³⁵⁶ Ascyrtos is likely to have been instrumental in the scene where Encolpius and Giton escaped from Lycurgus.

This is what underscores the unwitting appropriateness of Tryphaena's words when she asks what *ergastulum* had intercepted the boys on their flight (105.11). An *ergastulum* (< Gr. ἐργαστήριον) was a kind of prison on large private estates to which refractory or unreliable individuals were sent for work in chain-gangs, mostly slaves, but also freeborn men in debt (Sen. *Con.* 10.4.18; Liv. 2.23.6). Suetonius reports in the *Life of Tiberius* (*Tib.* 8) that one of the first responsibilities of the future emperor's civil career was to investigate and purge the private *ergastula* throughout Italy, which had gained a bad reputation for holding captive not only travelers of both free and servile status, but also those whom dread of military service had driven to such places of concealment. This was around 23 B.C.E. As the imperial biographer explains in the *Life of Augustus* (32.1f.), the practice had survived as a result of the lawless habits of the civil wars, but Octavian put an end to it by having the *ergastula* inspected, and by stationing guards wherever it seemed advisable for the protection of travellers.

Other such practices were the formation of associations under the title of a new guild (*titulo collegi noui*) to commit crimes of every sort. Suetonius says that Augustus at the same time had all guilds dissolved except the oldest and most legitimate. The "Caesar" of Apuleius' *Metamorphoses* does something similar when he bans the *collegium* of the robber Haemus, and has the band hunted out (*Met.* 7.7). It seems, indeed, that the boys and Eumolpus form just such a guild themselves.³⁵⁷ Encolpius' choice of adventures to tell to his Roman audience seems to be guided by a certain tendency towards sensationalism.³⁵⁸ The abuse of *ergastula* seems to have been one of those persistent rumors, like piracy and brigandage, which were rampant in the

³⁵⁶ 92.4, *timuique ne in contubernium recepissem [sc. Eumolpon] Ascyrti parem* ("I feared that I had taken into my friendship someone [Eumolpos] who was the equal of Ascyrtos").

³⁵⁷ 117.5, *in verba Eumolpi sacramentum iuravimus: uri, vinciri, verberari ferroque necari, et quidquid aliud Eumolpus iussisset, tanquam legitimi gladiatores domino corpora animasque religiosissime addicimus* ("we swore an oath dictated by Eumolpus, by which we submitted to being branded, fettered, scourged, put to the sword, and whatever else as Eumolpus directed, like professional gladiators we most solemnly committed bodies and souls to our master").

³⁵⁸ I believe it was Sandy 1979, 367, who introduced the excellent descriptive term "sensational" into the discussion of Greco-Roman fictions.

empire, and caused especially foreigners to fear the highways, perhaps needlessly.³⁵⁹

We could try to fit Fragment XI into this context.³⁶⁰ The mosquitoes which troubled Encolpius' comrade (or himself according to some manuscript readings), and may have caused him to hallucinate, would be appropriate in the *viridarium*. Apart from being forced to work as a slave, which he cannot have done well because of his inexperience of work and youthful delicacy (102.12), Encolpius may have been incorporated into Lycurgus' gladiatorial troupe. The name of Lycurgus, namesake of the legendary Spartan lawgiver, may evoke Spartan harshness and military boot camps. It may also evoke the myth of the violent and drunken Thracian king who attacked Dionysus and his party of nurses (*Il.* 6.130–40) and was subsequently imprisoned in a rocky cave (*Soph. Ant.* 955–65), later to cut off his foot (*Hyg. Fab.* 132.), commit suicide (*Hyg. Fab.* 242.2), or be killed by horses (*Apolod.* 3.5.1). Both connotations are ideal for someone engaged in the nasty business of training and dealing in gladiators (some of whom were incidentally called "Thracians"). The fact that Lycurgus is the namesake of the legendary Spartan legislator and the mythical Thracian king makes his name no less viable in this story than such names as Agamemnon, Menelaos, Circe or Gorgias. As a real captive under the control of Lycurgus, Encolpius could have been sent into the arena as a member of the *pars obscena* of Lycurgus' gladiatorial *ludus* to fight, possibly, a woman who seemed likely to kill him. He could then have escaped from the (*h*)arena, when it collapsed in an earthquake, by throwing himself into the latrine.

According to Ascyrtos' accusation and Encolpius' own confession, he killed a man at night who was his host. In both cases, this comes in sequence after he cheated the amphitheater (9.9; 81.3), and he certainly robbed Lycurgus' villa in the company of someone else.³⁶¹ He speaks of Ascyrtos, too, as

³⁵⁹ On the topic of piracy under the principate and the ideology of imperial eradication, see Braund 1993, 195–212.

³⁶⁰ Fulg. *serm. ant.* 52 (p. 124 [Helm]), *alucinare dicitur vana somniari, tractum ab alucitis, quos nos conopes dicimus. sicut Petronius Arbiter ait "nam contubernalem alucitae molestabant"* ["*contubernalem*" is Bücheler's emendation for a variety of readings in the manuscripts] ("*alucinare* means 'to have false dreams'. It is derived from *alucitae*, which we call 'mosquitoes'. Petronius Arbiter says: 'For the mosquitoes were afflicting my bed-companion'").

³⁶¹ 117.3, *atquin promitto quicquid exigeret, dummodo placeret vestis, rapinae comes, et quicquid Lycurgi villa grassantibus praeuisset. nam nummos in praesentem usum deum matrem pro fide sua reddituram* ("Anyhow, I promise to provide whatever he asked for, so long as the garment, my associate in the robbery, was good for it, and whatever the villa of Lycurgus had yielded when we broke into it").

being the co-possessor of the money stolen, then lost and later found again,³⁶² and of his animosity toward this Lycurgus as analogous to that which he directed at Ascyrtos, because of competition over Giton.³⁶³ Therefore we may assume that in this lost episode Encolpius told of a lusty affair between himself and Ascyrtos in a chain-gang in the garden of Lycurgus' villa, while Giton was doing the "work of a woman in the private jail", *opus muliebre in ergastulo* (81.5), under the command of Lycurgus. After the events in the amphitheater, the episode evidently ended with the murder of Lycurgus, the burglary of his villa, and the flight of Encolpius, Giton and Ascyrtos. The sequence of competitors for Giton's love seems to confirm this too. Ascyrtos takes over from Lycurgus (83.5f.), just like Encolpius fears that Eumolpus is taking over from Ascyrtos (92.4).³⁶⁴

2.2.5 In the *pinacotheca*

The importance and logic of the rivalry for possessing Giton in the *Satyrica* is well explained in the scene set in the *pinacotheca* where Encolpius projects his own anxiety on to the pictures of ancient masters in the gallery. Just as in

³⁶² 13.2–3, *Ascyrtos postquam depositum esse inviolatum vidit ... seduxit me paululum a turba et "scis," inquit "frater, rediisse ad nos thesaurum de quo querebar? illa est tunicula adhuc, ut apparet, intactis aureis plena"* ("When Ascyrtos saw that the deposit was untouched ... he took me a little aside from the crowd and said, 'Do you know, brother, that the treasure I was grumbling at losing has come back to us? That is the little tunic and still, as it appears, full of the gold coins which haven't been touched'").

³⁶³ 83.5–6, "*et omnes fabulae quoque habuerunt sine aemulo complexus. at ego in societatem excepi hospitem [sc. Ascyrtos] Lycurgo crudeliorem*" ("all the myths feature intercourse with no rival. I, on the other hand, took into my companionship a friend [Ascyrtos] more cruel than Lycurgus").

³⁶⁴ The mysterious Doris (126.18, *itaque tunc primum Dorida vetus amator contempsi*) is probably not a woman with whom Encolpius had an amatory association in the past. The word can either refer to a marble statue of the wife of Nereus and the mother of the Nereids, since the protagonist has in the previous passage been comparing Circe's beauty favorably to marble sculptures; or, as seems more probable, it is a *nom de guerre* temporarily assumed by Giton, like Polyaeus. The feminine gender may be explained by Giton's role as a sexual pathic, or possibly by reference to the frequency of male proper names of a female grammatical form (e.g., Protis, Apellis, Thespis, Zenothemis, Taxaris, Charmis) attested on inscriptions from Massalia. In any case, Giton is properly the only person with respect to whom Encolpius is a *vetus amator* (10.7, *veterem cum Gitone meo rationem*; 86.6, *vetustissimam consuetudinem*; 81.5, *veteris amicitiae nomen*), and the subject of the following negotiation is exactly Encolpius' willingness to betray Giton (127.3, *dono tibi fratrem meum*) with Circe, who has heard about their relationship, while there is no mention in the context of any past female lover of Encolpius.

the poem where Encolpius fancies his fortune to be comparable to that of ancient heroes struggling against divine wrath (139.2), the pictures of mythological lovers here inspire in the protagonist a lament about his own inability to have Giton completely for himself (83):

“ergo amor etiam deos tangit. Iuppiter in caelo suo non invenit quod eligeret, et peccaturus in terris nemini tamen iniuriam fecit. Hylan Nympha praedata imperasset amori sui, si venturum ad interdictum Herculem credidisset. Apollo pueri umbram revocavit in florem, et omnes fabulae quoque habuerunt sine aemulo complexus. at ego in societatem recepi hospitem Lycurgo crudeliorem.”

“So love touches the gods as well. Jupiter finds nothing to his taste in his heavenly kingdom, but when he goes to earth, his sinful intention does injury to nobody. The nymph who raped Hylas would have controlled her desire, had she thought that Hercules would come to forbid her. Apollo makes the likeness of his boy reappear in a flower, and all the myths feature intercourse with no rival. I, on the other hand, took into my companionship a friend more cruel than Lycurgus.”

Encolpius imposes a positive interpretation of the originally tragic stories of Hylas, Hyacinthus and Zeus' many loved ones in order to depict himself as the only tragic lover who cannot embrace his loved one without the interference of a rival, *sine aemulo*. We are reminded of Hippothous' story, where the same problem even causes the tragic death of the loved one. From the context we may determine that the crueler “friend”, *hospes*, is Ascyrtos, and the supposedly less cruel “host”, *hospes*, is the same Lycurgus who is the owner of the villa which the boys burglarize (117.3).

Taken together, all of Encolpius' rivals for the possession of Giton can be ordered into a sequence, which provides another linear structure to supplement the southward progression of the ship of Lichas, which has been established according to the geographical map. If we allow for a possible missing rival in Massalia itself, that one would have been followed by Tryphaena, then possibly Hedyle, then certainly Lycurgus, Ascyrtos, and Eumolpus himself for a while, and finally Tryphaena again. These two linear structures taken together, the geographical one and the amatory one, show well how the plot was structured and episodes connected around the earlier and the later voyage on the ship of Lichas, with the great interlude in Campania coming in between, while Encolpius and Giton stay off the ship. What this shows primarily is that we had in the original *Satyrical*, not several radi-

cally distinct episodes, as many scholars have thought, but a novelistic structure, episodic of course, but with a great deal of continuity from one episode to the next, fully comparable to the plots that we find in the extant erotic fictions.

Apart from the interrupted and then resumed voyage on the ship of Lichas, one could see as symbols of this continuity the three garments stolen by Encolpius, which follow him from episode to episode and continue to play a role in the plot. The *vestis divina* from the *navigium* of Lichas was stolen in the lost episode when the boys escaped from the ship and continues to play a role on the ship after the boys board it again (114.5). It may also have occurred in the trial scene (*Fr.* XII). The *tunicula aureis plena* is lost in the episode prior to the beginning of our text and then reappears in the market scene (13.3), and again in Croton as the *vestis rapinae comes* (117.3), with the money stolen from *Lycurgi villa*, which takes us even further back to the escape from Lycurgus. The *raptum latrocinio pallium* (12.2), which the boys try to sell in the market scene, turns out to be from the *sacellum Priapi* (19.8), an episode before the boys entered the *urbs Graeca*. In that scene Quartilla played a role. She disappears while the boys go to the school of rhetoric the morning after, and then reappears after the market scene to force the boys to remedy her tertian fever. These connections and reappearances between scenes make the episodes of the story anything but discrete.

2.2.6 A Love Letter

To complete our analysis of Encolpius' soliloquies and the material therein for the reconstruction of the plot of his story, we must take a look at two more passages. The former of the two is Encolpius' (*alias* Polyaeos') short letter, written on wax tablets, in response to the libidinous young matron Circe, after having failed her miserably as lover. The following is the full text of the letter (130.1–6):

“Polyaeos Circae salutem. fateor me, domina, saepe peccasse; nam et homo sum et adhuc iuvenis. numquam tamen ante hunc diem usque ad mortem deliqui. habes confidentem reum: quicquid iusseris, merui. proditionem feci, hominem occidi, templum violavi: in haec facinora quaere supplicium. sive occidere placet, <cum> ferro meo venio, sive verberibus contenta es, curro nudus ad dominam. illud unum memento, non me sed instrumenta peccasse. paratus miles arma non habui. quis hoc turnaverit nescio. forsitan animus antecessit corporis moram, forsitan dum

omnia concupisco, voluptatem tempore consumpsi. non inuenio quod feci. paralyisin tamen cavere iubes: tamquam ea maior fieri possit quae abstulit mihi per quod etiam te habere potui. summa tamen excusationis meae haec est: placebo tibi, si me culpam emendare permiseris”.

“Polyaenos greets Circe. I confess, my mistress, that I have often done wrong; for I am both human and still young. But never before this day have I committed a mortal sin. You have a confessed criminal at your disposal: whatever punishment you order, I have earned it. I have betrayed; I have killed a man; I have violated a temple: punish me for these crimes. If execution is fitting, I’ll bring my steel; or if you settle for the lash, I’ll run naked to my mistress. Just remember one thing: It wasn’t me, but my equipment, that sinned. A ready soldier, I had no arms. I don’t know who caused the damage. Perhaps the spirit rushed ahead of the sluggish body; perhaps when I was aflame with desire for all, I spent my pleasure meanwhile. It’s beyond me what I did. You tell me, however, to beware of paralysis: as if there could be any more than the one that took away from me that through which I could even have had you. Ultimately, however, my excuse amounts to this: I shall please you, if you allow me to make up for my wrongdoing.”

What stands out here are the three crimes to which Encolpius confesses. Two of them at least seem familiar: “I have killed a man; I have violated a temple (by temple robbery),” but the way in which this information about Encolpius’ past is presented, and especially its irrelevance to the addressee, Circe, combine to make it somewhat hard to explain. The first confession: “I have betrayed (a man),” is no different from the other two, although less familiar, for it can easily refer to the betrayal of Lichas, who never seems to have earned the treatment he got from Encolpius, since he was his savior and lover until Encolpius robbed the shrine of his ship and corrupted his wife. Lichas’ betrayal by the boys is in fact referred to by Eumolpus as *proditio* (107.6) in the apology he offers to the captain for the boys’ behavior.³⁶⁵ But why confess all this to Circe, who doesn’t know Lycurgus, Lichas and the other people in Encolpius’ past, and is interested only in having sex with him?

The rhetorical structure of the argument offered by Encolpius in apology for his conduct is based on his being human and still young (*nam et homo sum et adhuc iuuenis*) and therefore having often sinned (*fateor me, domina,*

³⁶⁵ The word *proditio* never refers to high treason in the *Satyrice*, but simply to giving oneself or someone else away or betraying a person’s trust (cf. 98.2, 125.3).

saepe peccasse), but never until this day, when he let down his mistress sexually by being unable to have an erection, has he committed a sin that is (almost) mortal (*numquam tamen ante hunc diem usque ad mortem deliqui*). Then he enumerates his many previous sins and shows his willingness to accept punishments for these (*habes confidentem reum: quicquid iusseris, merui ... in haec facinora quaere supplicium. sive occidere placet, <cum> ferro meo venio, sive verberibus contenta es, curro nudus ad dominam*). The list is the one we have discussed above (*proditionem feci, hominem occidi, templum violavi*). The trivialization of these serious crimes in comparison with the truly trivial offense of impotence is best taken as an amatory exaggeration for the sake of flattery of a loved one. The truthfulness of the crimes confessed to by Encolpius, and the predictable lack of moral condemnation on Circe's side, is exactly the point of this letter, which satirizes the presumed lawlessness of certain matrons who lust after slaves, bare-legged boys, gladiators, mule drivers, stage-actors, and condemned criminals (126.5–10). Such women, according to the moralistic ethos underlying the *Satyrica*, prefer the man they are having sex with to be all at once a traitor, murderer, and a temple-robber, since in their eyes this makes him more exciting as a lover. Encolpius can freely offer himself up for punishment for such crimes because he knows that Circe considers his sexual failure to be his only serious offense.³⁶⁶ Having said this, Encolpius can turn to the real apology.

His real apology to Circe is based on the dissociation of himself from his sexual organ, which has now become his sword or weapon, in a curious fusion of elegiac and Priapic humor: *paratus miles arma non habui* (*Ov. Am.* 3.7.71f.; *Priap.* 9.13f.). Encolpius as a lover is also a soldier, and his sword is his *mentula*; it is the part of his body in which he expects to be an Achilles (129.1), but something has gone wrong with the equipment, and for this, he claims, he cannot be blamed. Perhaps he was just over-excited; in any case, another try will certainly fix the situation, he promises. Brought into context with other retrospective statements in the *Satyrica*, our reading of the letter accounts sufficiently for the confessions of Encolpius, and there is no need

³⁶⁶ Even if what Encolpius is saying in *habes confidentem reum etc.* is “treat me as if I had betrayed, killed, robbed” or “let’s pretend that I ... and punish me accordingly”, this does not preclude that his supposedly false confessions are based on the truth. In fact, if no murder took place, the audience of the original full-text *Satyrica* might well get confused at this point, because Encolpius has certainly both betrayed Lichas and violated the temple of Priapus before the *Crypta Neapolitana*. What would be the point of mentioning here, for the third time (cf. 9.7, 81.3), a murder that never took place, side by side with other crimes that did?

to say with Schmeling that Encolpius suffers from the modern psychological condition of “confession-compulsion”, nor that his activity is comparable to the self-flagellation of the priest of the Syrian goddess in Apuleius (*Met.* 8.28).³⁶⁷

2.2.7 A Prayer to Priapus

The last passage that we shall consider belongs to the same context of Encolpius’ impotence. We have seen many forms of declarations, a dialogue, soliloquies and a letter. This time it is a poem and a prayer in one. Encolpius has been desperately seeking a cause and remedy for his impotence. After failing Circe for the first time, he immediately claimed that he had been poisoned (128.2, *veneficio contactus sum*). He began to wonder whether he had been permanently deprived of physical pleasure (128.5). He finds himself impotent with Giton as well (128.7, 129.1). Circe blames his relationship with Giton and suggests that he will regain his virility by abstaining from the boy for three days (129.8). Encolpius asks Circe for another rendezvous (130.6). Chrysis thinks it is just one more case of the local witches having put a spell on somebody, and therefore a cure should readily be available (129.10–11). Encolpius has tried to cut down on luxury: he skips baths, uses less oil, eats strong food, and drinks less wine; he takes a walk, and heeds Circe’s words by going to bed without Giton (130.7–8). Chrysis had brought a local witch who tried her hand at the task, and succeeded in giving Encolpius an erection (131.4–7). The cure, however, did not last and when he met her he failed Circe again; she has had him whipped, spat on, and thrown out; Chrysis has been flogged as well, and Proselenos, the witch, was thrown out of the house (132.2–5). Hiding in bed Encolpius has let loose his anger at the “cause of all evil”, his penis. In Sotadean or cinaedic verse he described his attempts to cut his member off with an ax but it escaped into the wrinkles of its foreskin (132.8). Next he had harangued the thing, demanding an explanation from the guilty party, but his *mentula* had only drooped in silence like Dido in the underworld (132.9–11). Afterwards he felt momentarily ashamed for having talked with his sexual organ, but he soon found justification for this behavior in numerous literary precedents of heroes talking to various body parts and he had also been able to appeal to the supposed belief of Epicurus that sex was the “end” (τέλος) of life (132.12–15). When he finished delivering this declamation, he called Giton and demanded that the boy tell him on his honor whether Ascyrtos had stayed awake that night when he

³⁶⁷ Schmeling 1994/5, 221f.

abducted him, and whether he had wronged him. Giton swore that Ascyrtos did not use violence (133.2). We next find Encolpius kneeling on the threshold in the shrine of Priapus praying to the god in hexameters.

Before we consider the relationship between his impotence, his question to Giton about Ascyrtos' sexual advances, and Priapus, let us go through the poetic prayer. After a very elaborate address to the god, Encolpius continues his invocation (133.3):

“huc ades, o Bacchi tutor Dryadumque voluptas,
 et timidas admitte preces. non sanguine tristi
 perfusus venio, non templis impius hostis
 admovi dextram, sed inops et rebus egenis
 attritus facinus non toto corpore feci.
 quisquis peccat inops, minor est reus. hac prece quaeso,
 exonera mentem culpaque ignosce minori,
 et quandoque mihi fortunae arriserit hora,
 non sine honore tuum patiar decus. ibit ad aras,
 sancte, tuas hircus, pecoris pater, ibit ad aras
 corniger et querulae fetus suis, hostia lactens.
 spumabit pateris hornus liquor, et ter ovantem
 circa delubrum gressum feret ebria pubes”.

“Draw near, bastion of Bacchus and darling of the Dryads, hearken to my humble prayers. I come not bathed in gloomy blood, nor have I raised my right arm as faithless enemy against temples, but poor and desperate in dire need and not with my whole body did I commit the crime. He, who sins penniless, is less a felon. In prayer I beg you, ease the mind and forgive a minor offense, and sometime when fortune smiles, I shall not let your glory be short of honor; to your altar, holy one, will go a horned goat, father of the flock; to your altar will go the farrow of a grunting sow, a milky victim. New wine will foam in open bowls, and drunken lads will dance and rejoice three times round your shrine.”

After having witnessed Encolpius' confession to homicide and violating a temple in the letter to Circe, and after what we know about his stealing sacred objects from at least two shrines, we must ask whether there is a contradiction in his proclamation here of innocence with respect to Priapus' temple: *non sanguine tristi / perfusus venio, non templis impius hostis / admovi dextram*. What exactly is Encolpius saying? He approaches (*venio*) the

god/temple not as one steeped in blood, i.e. as a murderer seeking sanctuary, or as one who has committed an act of violence in a temple and hence sacrilege, but as one who committed a crime because of poverty and only with a part of his body. In effect, he is saying: "I have committed a crime against you, Priapus, for which I plead (i) that I was driven by poverty, and (ii) that I did it *non toto corpore*—"not with all of my body". Encolpius' hope is that Priapus will forgive a minor offense, especially if promised a rich sacrifice in return for the clemency. The answer to the question above is therefore that we do not see any contradiction between the confession in the present prayer and the general crimes that Encolpius has already confessed on other occasions.

But what is the connection between Priapus and Encolpius' impotence? We have briefly discussed this problem in the previous section as part of our reading of the Fragment of Sidonius, and again as part of our reconstruction of the Quartilla episode, or episodes, just before and after the boys enter the *urbs Graeca*. Now we must review the evidence in the light of our reading of the confessional passages above.

The poem and prayer to Priapus indicates that Encolpius now derives the cause of his inability to have an erection from some offense, *facinus*, against Priapus. As we have seen, it is because of his continuing impotence that he later claims that he, like other heroes, is haunted by the wrath of a god, in this case of the garden deity Priapus (139.2). The alienated talk about a part, *pars*, of his body as if it were a separate entity and not integral to him is genuine Priapic humor, which is common in the extant corpus of Priapic poetry. Encolpius' excuse to Priapus in the prayer is the same that he gave Circe: *illud unum memento, non me sed instrumenta peccasse* (130.4), in both cases he blames *illa pars corporis* (129.1) where he once was an Achilles. Circe had asked him "Well, do you come whole today?" (131.10, "*ecquid hodie totus venisti?*"), and the narrator maliciously describes how he went *toto corpore* (131.11) into her embrace and enjoyed her to the full but only with his unbewitched kisses! His bewitched penis is still not functioning. Encolpius' attention continues to be fixed on his *mentula*, his *omnium malorum causa* (132.7). And he addresses a schizophrenic blame speech to it as if it were a separate individual from himself (132.12, *cum ea parte corporis verba contulerim*).

There is no room for doubt, then, that the *facinus* he confesses to having committed with only a part of his body was committed with his *membrum virile*. But when and where did Encolpius commit a crime against Priapus only with his penis? Not in Croton, obviously, because the last thing Encolpius did before praying to Priapus, and what furnishes him with proof of

what is wrong, was to inquire from Giton about how Ascyrtos had behaved sexually, i.e., whether Ascyrtos too was impotent, when he abducted Giton from his bed that night after the party at Trimalchio's.³⁶⁸ He gets an answer from Giton which is highly unreliable because Giton constantly fears Encolpius' jealousy, but this is less important for the reconstruction than the fact that Encolpius himself traces his impotence back to the *urbs Graeca*. Now, what happened to both Encolpius and Ascyrtos in the Greek city, which involved a crime against Priapus that could have led to their impotence? The answer to the question is clear. The boys disturbed the nocturnal rites of Quartilla's Priapic *sacrum ante Cryptam* (16.3), and stole a *pallium* from the members of the cult. They were subsequently punished by Quartilla, who came to their lodgings and sexually abused them after making them drink the aphrodisiac *satyrion*. As we recall, they were supposed to go back to her place the night after, but instead went to Trimalchio's party. This is Encolpius' one and only prior crime against Priapus in the extant text.

As Christopher Faraone has shown, the *satyrion* that Encolpius drank so much of at Quartilla's party (21.1), like other such drugs, was well known in antiquity for its double effects: It could both cause an erection and act as poison and render men impotent. We have already come across Pliny's statement (*Nat.* 6.96f. and 128) that a certain type of *satyrion* with a testicle-shaped root causes erections if taken in the milk of a farmyard sheep, but makes erections subside if taken in water.³⁶⁹ Faraone adds an interesting example from Achilles Tatius (4.15), where an Egyptian soldier lusting after Leucippe lets his servant mix an aphrodisiac into her wine. But the servant forgets to dilute the potion and Leucippe becomes mysteriously mad until Clitophon discovers the cause of her delirium and the antidote is administered. The type of liquid an ancient aphrodisiac was mixed in and the quan-

³⁶⁸ 133.1–2, *Gitona voco, et "narra mihi" inquam "frater, sed tua fide: ea nocte, qua te mihi Ascyrtos subduxit, usque in iniuriam vigilavit an contentus fuit vidua pudicaque nocte?" tetigit puer oculos suos conceptissimisque iuravit verbis sibi ab Ascyrtos nullam vim factam* ("I call Giton, and say: 'Tell me brother, but upon your honor: that night, when Ascyrtos took you away from me, did he stay awake until he had wronged you, or was he content with spending a chaste night all alone?' The boy touched his eyes and swore in the most precise words that he had suffered no violence from Ascyrtos").

³⁶⁹ Faraone 1990, 115, adds the information that "Mandrake, for instance, was used both as an aphrodisiac (Theophr. *HP* 9.9.1) and as a narcotic to paralyze an enemy (Plato, *Rep.*, 6.488c), or to treat insomnia (Arist. *PA* 456b31). Theophrastus reports that the roots of the *orchis* and another unnamed Plataean drug can both encourage and suppress sexual desire (*HP* 9.18.3–5). In the latter case, impotence could allegedly be extended as long as three months and could be used to discipline and manipulate servants. This correlation between debilitating narcotic and *philtrum* is underscored in Plutarch's advice to young brides not to use such aphrodisiacs on their husbands (*Mor.*, 139a)."

tity consumed was evidently believed to be of great importance for the drug's effect. Significantly, Encolpius drank *all* the *satyrion* at Quartilla's, and later does not merely blame the wrath of Priapus for his impotence, but also claims that he was magically poisoned.³⁷⁰ As is often the case in ancient magic, the cause is over-determined in that there is both a pragmatic and a religious explanation.

But how did Encolpius commit a *facinus* with only that part of his body which later is so disgracefully incapable of performing? At the time it evidently did perform, and the instrument was therefore in the erect position. Priapus is a phallic god and his erection is his iconographic emblem. In Aristophanes' *Lysistrata* (982) a man with an erection is mistaken for Konisalos, a phallic creature associated with Priapus, in a joke which resembles many in the *Satyricon*: "Are you a man or a Priapus?"³⁷¹ If we analyze the references to the alleged *facinus* against Priapus, there was some *urbanitas* or practical joke involved,³⁷² the impudent robbery is said to be more than fabulous,³⁷³ and a point is made of the facility with which it is possible to encounter a god in that region, as if to provide an excuse for how easily Quartilla and her acolytes were taken in by the boys.³⁷⁴ Although Quartilla insists that the *facinus*, or *scelus*, committed by Encolpius and Ascyltos cannot in principle be expiated, she is also aware that the strange ritual which the boys, who were driven by youthful horseplay, saw in the temple of Priapus could be

³⁷⁰ 138.7, "*forsitan rediret hoc corpus ad vires et resipiscerent partes veneficio, credo, sopitae*" ("maybe this body would come back to its strength, and the parts that were drowsed with poison, as I believe, might be themselves again"). It is true that the word *veneficium* also means "the use of magical arts, sorcery" (*OLD* s.v. 1) as well as "poison", but in this case the two senses are not separable.

³⁷¹ *Ar. Lys.* 982, σὺ δ' εἶ τί; πότερ' ἄνθρωπος ἢ κονίσσαλος; For the idea cf. 92.9, "*habet enim inguinum pondus tam grande, ut ipsum hominem laciniam fascini crederes*" ("his genitals hung down with such massive weight that you'd have thought the man himself was a mere appendage to his prick"). For the figure of speech, cf. *Sat.* 38.15, *phantasia, non homo*; 43.3, *discordia non homo*; 44.6, *piper non homo*; 58.13, *mufrius non magister*; 74.13, *codex non mulier*; 134.9, *lorum in aqua non inguina*.

³⁷² 16.4, "*nec accusat errorem vestrum [sc. Quartilla] nec punit, immo potius miratur, quis deus iuvenes tam urbanos in suam regionem detulerit*" ("Quartilla neither accuses nor punishes you for your mistake, instead she wonders what god has brought such urbane youths into her region").

³⁷³ 17.4, "*quaenam est*" inquit [sc. Quartilla] "*haec audacia, aut ubi fabulas etiam antecessura latrocinia didicistis?*" ("What is this audacity," said Quartilla, "that is, where did you learn to outrival the robbers of fables?").

³⁷⁴ 17.4–6, "*utique nostra regio tam praesentibus plena est numinibus ut facilius possis deum quam hominem invenire*" ("our region is so full of divine presence that you are more likely to run into a god than a man").

seen as a risible joke by the uninitiated;³⁷⁵ at the time Encolpius may have undressed and left his old tunic full of gold lying in a deserted place, and was perhaps clothed in a religious garment, for as he tells us in the market episode, he lost his shirt and acquired a splendid *pallium* with an intricate design.³⁷⁶ The supposition that best accounts for all of these bizarre references is the impersonation of Priapus by the naked Encolpius by virtue of his characteristic phallic looks. The reference of Sidonius Apollinaris to Encolpius (*alias* Arbiter) as *Hellespontiaco parem Priapo* directly connects the phallic looks of the protagonist to Priapus and thus further underscores our reconstruction of the lost first Quartilla episode.³⁷⁷

2.2.8 Encolpius Equal to a God?

If we were to look for a “comparison text” to aid us in the reconstruction of this obscure episode, it would soon become apparent that the motif of a man impersonating a god to exploit the superstition of some simple person is common enough in ancient literature. Josephus (*AJ* 18.66) tells a story from the reign of Tiberius of a young knight, Decius Mundus, who fell in love with an unassailably virtuous matron, Paulina. When bribing her didn’t work, he decided to kill himself. But his freedwoman, Ida, discovered a way to save him. She promised money to the priests of the temple of Isis in Rome, and one of them went to Paulina to say that the god had fallen in love with her and wished to see her. She became proud at the news and with her husband’s permission went to the temple. When she had dined and the doors were closed and the lamps removed, in place of Anubis, Mundus stepped forth and had sex with her the whole night. Later Paulina told her husband

³⁷⁵ 17.6, “*imprudentes enim, ut adhuc puto, admisistis inexplabile scelus*” (“I still believe that you committed your inexpiable crime unwittingly”); 17.7, “*ne scilicet iuvenili impulsu licentia quod in sacello Priapi vidistis, vulgetis deorum consilia proferatis in populum*” (“I am afraid that youthful license will lead you to broadcast what you saw in the chapel of Priapus, and reveal the gods’ counsels to the mob”); 17.8, “*petoque et oro ne nocturnas religiones iocum risumque faciatis*” (“I beg and pray you not to make a laughingstock of our nocturnal worship”).

³⁷⁶ 12.5, *videbatur ille [sc. rusticus] mihi esse qui tuniculam in solitudine invenerat* (“that rustic seemed to me to be the one who found the little tunic where it was abandoned”); 12.2, *raptum latrocinio pallium ... splendor vestis* (“the stolen pallium ... the splendor of the garment”); 14.5, *mulier... inspectis diligentius signis* (“the woman ... having carefully inspected the signs”).

³⁷⁷ The line of Sidonius is a pastiche of 139.2 vv. 8–9, *me quoque per terras, per cani Nereos aequor / Hellespontiaci sequitur gravis ira Priapi*, which as we saw above can only refer to the Quartilla episode, and its aftermath in Encolpius’ impotence.

and women friends and all marveled at the incident. But Mundus confronted Paulina and told her the truth, and the lady told her husband. Tiberius had both the priests and the freedwoman Ida crucified, but not Mundus himself. He was sent into exile, since he was considered to have been compelled to the deed by the sheer force of his desire. The incident was soon worked into a mime, *Moechus Anubis* (Tert. *Apol.* 15).

The tenth letter of Pseudo-Aeschines provides further examples of the motif. The main story is set in Ilium. The lad Cnemon hides by the banks of Scamander, while the local virgins, and especially Callirhoë, perform a ritual in which they wash in the river and address the river god with these words: "Take, Scamander, my maidenhood." When Callirhoë pronounces the formula Cnemon jumps forth from the bushes saying: "I accept with pleasure, and I take Callirhoë—being Scamander, I shall do many good things," and then disappears again with the maiden. A few days later, Callirhoë recognizes him in a procession and immediately throws herself flat in reverence to the god, and looking askance at her nurse she says: "Behold the god Scamander, to whom I gave my virginity." The older woman understood what had happened and the story got out. Having related this story, Pseudo-Aeschines then goes on to tell how Cnemon wasn't afraid but on the contrary provided him with other examples of similar deeds: many stories involving gods impersonated, stories which told of how Meander, Heracles, Apollo, and Dionysus unjustly gained a reputation for being "adulterers" (μοιχοί).

Relevant to Encolpius' postulated impersonation of Priapus are what appear to be similar perversions of religious rituals in the fragments of Lollian's Φοιβεϊκικά (*POxy* 1368) and the *Iolaos* fragment (*POxy* 3010). In the former a group of young men dress themselves in black or white garments to play ghosts in preparation for what seems to be a raid by robbers. In the latter, according to the reconstruction of E.R. Dodds,³⁷⁸ a young man of full male potency attempts to gain access to a woman by impersonating a castrated *gallus* or *cinaedus*. Such trickery seems to be generic to ancient erotic fictions, especially the sensational and criminal ones.³⁷⁹

It seems therefore plausible to assume that Encolpius' crime against Priapus may derive from the lost incident at the Priapean temple presided over by Quartilla in the vicinity of Neapolis by the road to the *Crypta Neapolitana*. Accordingly, Encolpius would suspect that Quartilla in revenge secretly poisoned him. He certainly does derive his impotence from the curse of somebody who wished harm on both himself and Ascylos. His inquiry about Ascylos' capacity for lovemaking would otherwise barely make

³⁷⁸ See Parsons 1974, 37.

³⁷⁹ See also Sandy 1979, 374–5.

sense. Quartilla and her *satyrion*, however, offer a plausible explanation. The dramatic irony in Encolpius' accepting as evidence of Ascyrtos' impotence what Giton tells him adds a further comic twist to the episode. Giton is, of course, likely to offer false assurances only to calm Encolpius who is prone to rabid jealousy. The wrath of Priapus is therefore likely to be no more than Encolpius' fantasy, which is not to say that it isn't important for the story. Besides, in this connection between the episodes before and in the *urbs Graeca* we have another indication of the lack of discreteness of the episodes, and a further support for our thesis that in the *Satyrica* we are dealing with a typical ancient novelistic plot.

2.2.9 Conclusions

To wrap up our reconstruction of the *Satyrica* in this and the preceding chapter it will be helpful if we summarize the four main principles on which our restoration of the story is based. The first is geographical and pertains to the movement of the ship of Lichas from Massalia, to Ostia, to Puteoli, to Neapolis, and finally to the bay of Tarentum, where the ship and its captain meet their destruction. The linear and regular progression of the ship was evidently the main organizing principle of the plot of the original *Satyrica*. Where Encolpius & Co. go after Croton is impossible to say, but we are inclined to think that Trimalchio's ambitions to cross over to Africa from Neapolis without ever sailing along the confines of another man's property (48.3), and Eumolpus' posing as an African landowner (117.8, 125.3, 141.1), might be anticipatory indications in Encolpius' narrative that this is where the plot is soon heading, when the extant text breaks off. Perhaps the legacy-hunters of Croton decided to go with Eumolpus to inspect his supposed African estates, when he didn't die from the sicknesses that he was feigning. More likely, Eumolpus fades out (as others before), perhaps by *Scheintod*.³⁸⁰ Africa and especially Egypt provide the background for many an episode in the extant erotic fictions. Whatever happened next, Encolpius in any case seems to tell the story in Rome itself, just like Lucius in the *Metamorphoses*, since his audience is so typically Roman. We should keep in mind that Encolpius does not have to return to Massalia, any more than Hippothous or Lucius in the Latin version of the Ass-Story, return to their homes.³⁸¹

³⁸⁰ I see no grounds for believing with Schmeling 1992a that the plot is nearing closure in the Croton episode.

³⁸¹ The view that Encolpius goes to Lampsacus on the Hellespont is unfounded and derives from a misunderstanding of the role of Priapus in the plot.

The second principle of reconstruction is literary and relies on the convention of ancient narratives of recapitulating prior happenings of the story in later episodes. The most informative of these recapitulations regard Encolpius' relationship with Ascyrtos, who first enters the story after Encolpius and Giton leave the ship of Lichas. We thus get recapitulations of the events that happened between the first and the second voyages, and brief allusions to a trial, a stay in the private jail of Lycurgus' villa, Encolpius' adventure in the arena, and finally his murder of the host, Lycurgus, and escape from the villa/jail-house, in the company of Ascyrtos and his dear Giton.

A third principle regards the remarkable regularity of the pattern, first observed by Ciaffi, of the threats to Encolpius' love affair with the irresistible Giton. A third individual appears as a savior, only to turn into a rival and therefore an enemy of the protagonist. Thus we can construct a sequence of such rivals, which agrees with the reconstruction based on the former two principles: Tryphaena, (Hedyle), Lycurgus, Ascyrtos, Eumolpus, Tryphaena. The key to the reconstruction is the realization that the driving force of the plot is not so much the "wrath of Priapus" as the jealousy of Encolpius. His possession of Giton is constantly being threatened by rivals and outsiders who fancy the pretty boy as well.

The fourth structural principle is the observation that the episodes of the *Satyrica* are not autonomous or discrete units, as is often assumed on the basis of more or less isolated readings of individual parts of the work,³⁸² but no less an organizational whole than the plots of the fully extant ancient fictions. From the route of the voyage, the recapitulations and the sequence of rivals which threaten Encolpius, it is clear that the first part of the extant *Satyrica*, as well as much of what preceded it and is now lost, was indeed a long digression between the first and the second voyages on the ship of Lichas. Apart from the very first books of the original *Satyrica*, which were set in Massalia and dealt with the year of preparation for Encolpius' excommunication from the city, the greatest part of the story is structured around the voyage on the ship and the complex love affairs between the passengers, the captain and his wife. The voyage included several interludes on shore. Stops were made in Ostia, which allowed Encolpius to visit Rome during the Saturnalia, but most importantly, Encolpius abandons the ship in Campania in an attempt to free himself from Tryphaena's monopoly of Giton's affec-

³⁸² For a recent attempt to modify this view, see Schmeling 1994/5, 209, "The *Satyrica* appears to be written in discrete episodes each with its own beginning and end but strung and held together by one narrator who is also an actor in each." Although true in so far as it stresses the importance of the narrator for the unity of the narrative, Schmeling's statement nevertheless ignores the unity of plot in the *Satyrica*.

tion and perhaps the captain's interest in himself. This absence from the ship involved several episodes and the introduction of new characters. However, the return to the ship shows that we are not dealing with loosely connected episodes, but a consistently structured novelistic plot.

On the whole, we have tried to recover as much information as possible about the missing episodes of the *Satyrica* by sketching a pattern of the missing pieces of the jig-saw puzzle that is the reconstruction of the work, so that the few pieces that we do have are made to cohere in a reasonably structured composition. Necessarily, this reconstruction is tentative and sometimes *exempli gratia*. Although we have occasionally for the sake of argument insisted on arranging the pieces in one way rather than another, it is clear that it could at some points differ in detail.

2.3 Rewriting the *Satyrica* (My Turn)

2.3.1 The Nature of the Summary

The interpretive summary I am about to offer will bring together the reconstruction of the previous chapters and serve as an aid to the reader in rehearsing the fragmentary and sometimes incoherent story told in what is left of the *Satyrica*. The preserved text contains numerous explicit and implicit references to lost episodes. We should interpret these references just as we do other passages of the work, and in doing so we inevitably form ideas about what was in the lost parts. Any complete interpretation of the *Satyrica*'s fragments includes this sort of expansion, for otherwise we must paradoxically treat the extant text as an artistic whole, ignoring its original design as an extended narrative. The episodes related before the extant text begins are naturally speculative, but they are based on my arguments in the previous chapters. What I have done is merely to map out a minimum narrative that accommodates i) all references back from the text, and ii) all germane fragments. The reception of the extant text of the *Satyrica* has been a singularly creative one from the very beginning. My creative or speculative summary is therefore merely in accordance with the traditional response to the fragmented state of the tradition. By offering a separate restorative summary, however, I have avoided the graver mistake of exercising my ingenuity on the text itself with arbitrary emendations.

The following short narrative reads as Greco-Roman erotic fiction. Sullivan, in his major study of the work from the late sixties, stopped short of providing a summary, because he thought "a summary of the missing (and extant) episodes gives a misleading impression, the impression merely of a picaresque romance or an adventure story."³⁸³ If a summary gives that impression, however, that seems indeed to have been the extended form of the work. Not long ago, moreover, in commenting on the introduction of modern theory into the study of the ancient novel, Sullivan himself made the point that reader-oriented theories such as that of Wolfgang Iser, because they in any case make much of the reader's role in extracting a meaning from the

³⁸³ Sullivan 1968, 38.

text, should be taken by Petronian scholars as an encouragement “to be more enterprising in their theories about the missing portions of the *Satyricon*.”³⁸⁴

It seems to me justifiable to go into considerable detail in the summary, which will make it rather long. This should be viewed as an attempt to introduce my position on numerous points that are in danger of being lost if merely presented as part of a detailed argumentation.³⁸⁵ Details of the following summary will be presented without further arguments. If, as I hope is not the case too often, my summary contains items that are not supported by any arguments in the preceding chapters, the reader should take these as purely speculative. I shall retain the form of personal recollection for the sake of fidelity to the narrative structure of the original, although this goes contrary to the general practice in summaries.³⁸⁶ Though the basic stance of the original is thus respected, obviously no attempt will be made to represent faithfully the discursive variety of the work, nor have I found a way to represent faithfully the psychological or rhetorical posturing of the narrator, Encolpius. Justification for the former license could be found in my belief that the *Satyricon* is not primarily a poetic text, but privileges prose as its discourse of choice. (The book numbers are merely approximate.)

2.3.2 Speculative Summary

[ca. 2 books]. Since you insist, I shall stitch together for you the varied tales of my woes, and tell of how I traveled to many cities and got to know the minds of many people. I’m from Massalia, and my name is Encolpius. My ancient Greek settlement in the middle of barbaric Gallia counts among its famous citizens certain travelers who explored the outer-ocean, and came back to tell incredible tales. In this aristocratic and austere outpost of civilization I was given an old-fashioned education. But when I was still young, I fell in love with a boy named Giton, a

³⁸⁴ Sullivan 1990, 91–101.

³⁸⁵ It may be argued that the summary I am providing is a reconstruction of the text since it postulates one sort of text rather than another. However, I nowhere intend to restore the lost text *verbatim* nor do I claim the status of the original for my speculative summary. Instead, the summary is entirely supplementary to the received text and fragments, merely attempting to explain and interpret those.

³⁸⁶ For a summary of the *Asinus Aureus* or *Metamorphoses* of Apuleius which likewise respects the narrative form of the original, see Winkler 1985, 3f. For other and sometimes different summaries of the plot, see Ernout 1923, xlii–vii; Sage 1929, xxxv–xxxvii; Waters 1902, xxv–xxxi; Maiuri 1945, 51–85 (only the *Cena*, but very detailed); Bücheler 1862, 233–6; Sullivan 1968, 34–80; van Thiel 1971, 25–65; and now Schmeling 1996, 461–469.

neighbor of mine, and the most handsome and intelligent lad in the whole of Massalia. Unfortunately, my poverty caused me to have little to give him in return for his favors. However, a plague had afflicted the city and the priests were looking for someone who was fit to play the scapegoat in return for being fed for a whole year at public expense. And so, out of need, I offered myself as the scapegoat, and was accepted on account of my anatomy. During this period of easy living I grew fatter and healthier every day from eating figs and other pure food that people gave me. The rumor about my large penis soon filled the city, and fanned the flames of desire in a certain lady of good standing whose name was Tryphaena. This beautiful and wealthy woman approached me through her maids, and great intimacies began between us.

This year of good living, however, was soon ending and the much-dreaded ritual drew nigh. On the appointed day, I was dressed up according to custom with branches and in sacred attire, and thus exposed to the rage of the citizenry, I was led through all the streets of the city, while they cursed my person and seemed to direct their attention particularly at my private parts. This awful experience, which was not just painful but extremely humiliating to myself, finally ended in my escape from Massalia and into exile.

Tryphaena finally came to my rescue, for she knew the captain of a very large merchantman from Tarentum anchored in the harbor of Massalia. His name was Lichas and he had his wife with him on the ship. When I refused to leave without Giton, Tryphaena consented to his coming with me for she knew that we couldn't live without each other. She herself decided to sail off into voluntary exile, to freely pursue her own pleasures in the world. With her came a large retinue of slaves and many other possessions.

[ca. 3 books]. Although the ship was ultimately bound for Tarentum, where the captain had his wealthy estate, we had to make many stops on the way. We first set sail for Ostia, the harbor city of Rome itself. Once at sea, Tryphaena began to show greater interest in Giton than in me, and to my distress the boy seemed not much to mind her attention. The captain, however, made little attempt to hide his interest in my person, and under the circumstances I could not refuse him certain favors in token of my gratitude. After a few days sailing a violent storm fell upon us, and suffering much hardship we made it into Portus, the harbor of Ostia. From there we went on land to the world's capital. During our stay the Romans celebrated an ancient festival in commemoration of the licentious equality that prevailed on earth in the golden age of Saturn. For

several days unrestrained liberty prevailed in the streets of Rome; slaves ridiculed their masters, and spoke with license on every subject; priests made sacrifices with their heads uncloaked; criminals were spared; schools were closed; all was riot and debauchery.

[ca. 2 books] We barely escaped from the madness, boarded the ship again and headed for Campania. Now, the sweet harmony that had reigned among crew and passengers was beginning to turn bitter. I could no longer tolerate Tryphaena's monopoly of Giton's affection. The two were attempting to exclude me, and the unfairness of it made my blood boil with rage. Besides, on board was also the captain's wife, Hedyle, who from the start did not like her husband's interest in me, and had now caught him in his flagrant marital violations. Predictably, she wanted somehow to take revenge on him and at the same time to satisfy her own desires. Upon arriving in another Roman harbor, Puteoli, we left the ship and went on foot to nearby Baiae. In this wanton bathing resort, the matron Hedyle, Giton and I secretly shared some licentious moments in the company of her maids, and finally we struck a pact to flee from the ship. I first of all wanted to get Giton away from Tryphaena to restore our old relationship. When the others were still at Baiae, the three of us went back to the ship and I stole the sistrum and fine robe of the ship's protecting deity, Isis, because, as I hoped, it would fetch a fine price later when sold. In the olden days travelers used to be fed by pious people, but in our times nobody helps a stranger without a profit. When we were still in the portico of Hercules in the harbor area of Puteoli, we ran into Lichas and Tryphaena who had come to suspect what was afoot. A violent confrontation ensued where I denounced Tryphaena's wicked ways and said that she was to blame for our elopement. Hedyle appealed to nearby sailors for help, claiming her husband was a common pirate who was trying to abduct her friends and herself. The last we saw of them was that our noble sailors were beating and making ready to mug a clamoring and furious Lichas.

[ca. 2 books]. It slowly dawned on me that I was embarking on a criminal career, and my fear of being caught made me intensely uneasy. At first we stayed with Hedyle, but it seemed to me that she was turning into another Tryphaena, and so I began to look for ways to get rid of her. What I wanted primarily was to be alone with Giton. In a market in Puteoli, I tried to sell for our sustenance the fine robe and rattle of Isis. However, an advocate named Euscion caught us and accused us of having simply stolen the expensive items. The cruel man loudly screamed that we were fugitives and couldn't possibly be the rightful owners of so

many regal spoils. A true Cerberus of the courts, he kept barking his accusations until we were forced to hand over the goods and had to promise that we would show up in court the day after. We were badly shaken and our chances of escaping were slim, but as it happened a rich gentleman by the name of Lycurgus spotted us and took an immediate liking to our persons. Lycurgus was an influential man, and he sent his steward to make a deal with the magistrates, who upon being paid handed us over to his custody.

[ca. 3 books]. And so it was that I got rid of Hedyle and against all odds I escaped trial. We, of course, were very happy to have found a savior, and gladly went with him to his sumptuous Campanian villa. Soon, however, it became clear what he intended for me, because, as I discovered, he had a private jailhouse on his estate. Though I had escaped the harshness of public justice, the hardships I suffered in the private paradise of this cruel man were worse. Giton, however, got different treatment, for in the daytime Lycurgus made him do the job of a woman in the jail, but at night he brought the boy to his bed. This arrangement greatly upset my feelings. In this slave-gang for free men, I met Ascyltos, a young man of a very similar fortune to myself. He didn't run from my sexual advances, and so we became lovers in the garden, where we otherwise often suffered great hardships from being bitten by flies, but mainly because we were still young and unhardened and certainly not accustomed to working. In fact, because of my soft nature, I was not of much use to Lycurgus, until he decided that he could use me in his gladiatorial company. I wasn't even trained, but when the day arrived they dressed me in a delicate tunic, and forced me into the center of the spectacle, where I was shamefully matched with a woman, who almost killed me. As the laughter filled the amphitheater, Fortune saw fit to save my life by bringing on a great earthquake, which shook down the theater. Many died but I escaped by hurling myself into the latrine. After the disaster, when night had fallen, I returned again to the villa of Lycurgus. When I met Ascyltos again, he commented on the awful stench that came from my person, but decided to join me in my plans to escape. I had been careful to hide from Ascyltos the true nature of my relationship with Giton. Ascyltos and I broke into the villa and found Giton sadly sleeping in the arms of Lycurgus. I was so enraged that I killed my enemy and so saved my dearest Giton. The boy helped me to find a treasure of gold coins that the miser Lycurgus had sowed into his shirt. This we took with us and some other articles that we could carry.

[Book 13?]. The three of us, Ascyrtos, Giton and I, had now formed a company and decided to share our belongings. It was our plan to take refuge in Naples, a Greek city nearby, which was reputed to have schools of declamation and inhabitants who loved eloquence and the liberal arts. We hoped there to reap benefits from an environment so congenial to the educated. At night we moved southwards along the highway, but as we emerged from the *Crypta Neapolitana* we came upon a shrine sacred to Priapus. The cult was engaged in a wild orgy, and when I suddenly appeared to them during the celebration half naked and out of nowhere, they immediately fell to my feet and worshipped me as if I were Priapus. There I stood impersonating the god, stick and all, and those superstitious people first completely undressed me then clothed me in an expensive robe. I was still wearing this outfit when I ran away and accidentally left behind the gold coins in the old shirt. From a distance I saw a rustic find it where I had left it unguarded. Ascyrtos did not believe me and suspected that I had stolen the money myself. Late that night we finally arrived at our destination, where we checked into a lodging house. That night I still couldn't enjoy the pleasures of Giton because Ascyrtos kept a wakeful eye on the boy.

[Book 14]. When the sun came up the next morning, Ascyrtos and I put our plan into practice and went straight to the local school of rhetoric where we first encountered the *antescholarius* Menelaus and then listened to a *suasoria* delivered by the rhetor Agamemnon. In the portico outside the school we introduced ourselves to him and he promised to take us along to a dinner-party that night. The discussion turned to eloquence and I tried to impress him by delivering a short tirade against the vices of modern declamation. Agamemnon appreciated my sound judgment, but defended his profession and extemporized a little poem on morals and education. Ascyrtos disappeared in the middle of the poem, and when I noticed this, I too went after him because his recent interest in Giton caused me not to trust him. But I got lost in the city and when I asked for directions to my home, a street-vendor tricked me into a brothel where she said I must live. There I ran into Ascyrtos who said a man who wanted to have sex with him had similarly tricked him. We barely managed to escape from this place. Resuming my erratic search for the inn I finally caught a glimpse of Giton in a mist, standing in the street. When the boy had showed me our lodgings, I asked him about lunch, but he started sobbing and told me that Ascyrtos had been there earlier and had attempted to rape him. I was furious and quarreled bitterly with Ascyrtos, who defended himself by reminding me that he had

allowed me to do with him in the garden what he had attempted to do with the boy at the inn. I wanted to break up our friendship right away, in order to resume my old relationship with Giton. Ascyrtos, however, pointed out that Agamemnon had invited us that night to go with him to a dinner-party, and so, since I was both hungry and penniless, I reluctantly agreed to postpone the breakup until the day after. After checking to see whether Ascyrtos had left I hurried to take my pleasure with Giton, but before I was completely finished, Ascyrtos came back and interrupted our lovemaking, beating and taunting me for what I was doing with Giton.

As a preparation for dividing our belongings we went to the forum to sell the stolen robe from the cult of Priapus. Through Fortune's wondrous play, the man and the woman who came up to us and showed interest in the garment had with them our shirt with the money. I realized that the man was the rustic who had found the shirt, and that he was trying to sell it without knowing its actual worth. I wanted to claim my property, but as I knew from previous experience the courts are both corrupt and unfavorable to strangers, and so we decided that it was better to buy it back, except we had no money. Suddenly, the woman recognized the pallium from its signs and called out for the bystanders to grab the thieves! We were each holding on to the others' garment, when some shady jurists came up to us. They claimed both parties were suspected of stealing and therefore we had to deposit the pallium to be exhibited in court the day after. We, of course, demanded likewise that the others also deposit the shirt. But the rustic grew so indignant at being accused of stealing the seemingly worthless shirt that instead of depositing it he threw it in Ascyrtos' face. And so by chance we fully recovered our treasure. But on the way back we were followed by the woman, who turned out to be the maid of Quartilla, the priestess of the cult of Priapus, which I had tricked the night before. She herself soon arrived at the inn and demanded that we help her find a remedy for her tertian fever, which she said was caused by the cold which resulted from her religious awe after the sacrilegious trick played on her. She now took over the inn, and her maid immediately went to work on my penis, which was totally frigid. When Ascyrtos and I tried to struggle we were tied up and taken back to the shrine of Priapus where I was given the aphrodisiac satyrion and we told each other erotic stories. After I had drunk most of the satyrion, I became all fired up and Quartilla and I had intercourse. Later she had us tortured and assaulted by a *cinaedus*. The whole party fell asleep out of exhaustion, but we soon woke up again, and Quartilla made

sure we stayed awake most of the night, claiming that the orgy was an all-night vigil for Priapus. She and her maid Psyche staged the marriage of poor Giton and “Nightlong” (Pannychis), a slave girl of hers who looked no older than seven. Neither boy nor girl seemed to mind getting married, and Quartilla dragged me close to her to watch their childish play through a hole in the door. Towards morning Ascylos, Giton and I were allowed to return to our lodgings, after promising to return for a last dinner of liberty the day after.

[Book 15]. Now came the second day of our stay in the city, when the tertian attack of Quartilla would come, if our remedy hadn’t worked. We were terrified of the prospect of returning to her place, and I was especially worried about her threat to have Giton as an erotic appetizer that evening. But one of Agamemnon’s slaves came by to remind us of another dinner invitation for scholars, this time to the house of the freedman Trimalchio. So we forgot about Quartilla and walked to the baths, where we met with this extremely wealthy and eccentric person, Trimalchio, and later went home with him. His house was a maze of bizarre decor and his servants behaved like public entertainers and tricksters rather than the household of a *pater familias*. The food was likewise, and every dish turned out to be made of something other than what it had seemed at first. Trimalchio was constantly showing off his love of the liberal arts and readily put on display his jumbled knowledge, but we, the scholastics that we were, were forced to stay silent except to flatter him, or else never be invited again. Meanwhile the freedmen, who were his guests, rambled on in an unschooled manner, even attacking us for our arrogance and saying that we had become silly from literature. Habinnas, a stonemason working on the host’s tomb, was a late arrival to the party. When Trimalchio recklessly wanted us to take a bath on a full stomach we tried to escape from his house for the first time, but the doorkeeper and his hellish watchdog turned us back. The place was beginning to seem like the underworld, as we were unable to leave. When the household was rehearsing the funeral of their drunken master the noise was so great that the night watch thought the villa was on fire and broke in. Then we took the opportunity, said good-bye to Agamemnon, and finally made our escape.

[Book 16?]. Through Giton’s intelligence we at last made it back to our lodgings in the dark of night, and once there I tried to make love to the boy, but fell asleep in the middle of the action out of sheer drunkenness. While I was unconscious, Ascylos, the scoundrel, stole Giton away from me and brought him to his own bed. When I woke up the morning

after and found my bed empty I first planned to kill both of them in their sleep but decided not to and instead beat Giton out of the bed and demanded that Ascyrtos leave right away. He didn't protest and we proceeded to divide the spoils. But then he insisted that we split Giton as well, as if he too were our common property. I thought he was joking, but he drew his sword and threatened to cut off his share. I grabbed my sword and we prepared to fight, but Giton begged us to calm down, and said he alone deserved to die, because he had violated the oath of friendship. Ascyrtos suggested that the boy be allowed to choose whom he wished to follow, and I eagerly consented to this plan, thinking that my long-standing relationship with the boy had forged unbreakable ties between us. Given a choice the boy didn't even hesitate but straightway preferred Ascyrtos and left with him. I was thunderstruck with sorrow and jealousy and moved to another lodging where I locked myself in for three days. I realized the mistake I had made. In getting rid of Lycurgus I had taken into my trust Ascyrtos, who was even crueler. I decided to avenge my disgrace and kill the couple, and so I armed myself with a sword and went out to look for them in the porticoes. But a soldier I met on the way stopped me and confiscated my sword. Perhaps he was just a thief. Later I was glad that he had frustrated my murderous plan.

I came to a temple where there was a gallery full of old paintings. A poet named Eumolpus entered the temple and introduced himself to me as I stood there admiring pictures of mythical lovers who, unlike me, enjoyed their loved ones without competition. Eumolpus tried to persuade me that his ragged looks were a proof of his talent, since it showed him to be better than the parasites who compromise artistic integrity by flattery at the tables of the rich. Rich men, he said, hate and persecute the lovers of letters in order to make them, too, seem venal and subservient to money. I told him about Giton and my erotic sorrows, and to cheer me up he told me a tale of his conquest of a Pergamene boy. His story was intended to show how all boys put up resistance at first and have to be bought, but later cannot get enough of a good thing. Then we discussed the decline of the classical arts and that led to his improvising on the fall of Troy, which was the subject of the painting I had been admiring in the gallery. Eumolpus had to stop reciting when those walking in the gallery pelted him with stones. He fled the temple and I followed him down to the sea fearing that I too might be taken for a poet. When we were out of reach of their missiles, I told him he was crazy and that I too would throw stones at him if he didn't stop talking like a poet instead of a man. He acknowledged that he had often met with such negative applause but

promised to control himself in the future. We decided to have dinner together at my place.

We went to the baths and there I found Giton alone guarding the clothes of Ascyrtos and looking unhappy. I took him back to the inn and left Eumolpus reciting at the baths. My love for Giton quickly caused me to forgive him. He told me he had only chosen Ascyrtos because he was stronger, out of concern for my welfare, because otherwise I would have suffered at his hands. When night came and dinner was served Eumolpus returned. I was afraid he would bring back Ascyrtos, but when he turned out to be alone I let him in. He told of how someone by the name of Ascyrtos had lost his clothes in the baths and had been left standing naked, while a crowd gathered to admire his enormous member, which made the boy himself look like a mere appendage. Finally, a Roman knight who eagerly came to his assistance escorted the young man home. The poet finally contrasted this fine appraisal of a penis to the disgraceful rejection of his poetry. When Eumolpus saw Giton, he immediately became interested in him, while I feared that I had taken into my trust yet another rival for Giton's love. I was further irritated by Giton's positive admiration for the old man. I showed Eumolpus the door, but he tricked me by locking me in and going after the boy. I decided to hang myself, but was stopped by the two of them upon returning. Giton said he would die before me and proceeded to cut his throat with a razor. I too grabbed the same weapon and tried to kill myself but it turned out to be an especially blunted razor for beginners and so neither of us was harmed. A lodger now entered the room complaining about the noise and soon Eumolpus was fighting with a whole group of lodgers outside. I was so angry with him that I enjoyed watching him being beaten. When Giton wanted to help the old man, I hit him on the head and made him cry. Finally, Bargates the caretaker of the block saved Eumolpus, for they were acquainted and he wanted to employ the poet to compose invective against his mistress. At this moment Ascyrtos arrived with a public herald to proclaim the loss of Giton and offer rewards for his restitution. I made Giton hide under a bed and sought to soften Ascyrtos' anger by lying to him that I had not seen Giton, and claimed that his search was just a pretext to kill me. He assured me that he was still my friend, and in the end he left with the herald. Eumolpus now rushed into the room and threatened to fetch Ascyrtos again to collect the reward. But I pleaded with him, saying that the boy had run away, but then Giton sneezed and gave himself away. The boy nursed the old man's injuries and together we appealed to his humanity and culture. He said it was his custom to

live dangerously and promised to spare us, but demanded that we either follow him or lead the way to somewhere else.

[Book 17?]. It was dark night when we followed him aboard an unknown ship and spread our blankets in a secret place on the deck. To our extreme horror we soon discovered that we had inadvertently returned to the ship of Lichas and that Tryphaena was still aboard. When we told this to Eumolpus, he begged us to believe that although he had used the ship before he hadn't known about our enmities with the captain and his passenger. In our confusion we sought a solution to our problems by arguing pro and contra as they do in the schools but we found declamation useless for solving real problems. Finally, we shaved our heads and Eumolpus inscribed our foreheads with ink to give credence to his story that we were his branded runaway slaves. As we were shaving, however, a seasick passenger saw us and reported our ominous behavior at sea. Both the captain and Tryphaena, who had been desperately looking for us, had mysteriously dreamt that we had come on board the ship again. When we were dragged before the captain and his female passenger, she and her handmaidens recognized Giton, and he himself recognized my penis, and addressed it by my name, Encolpius. Eumolpus boldly pleaded our case, but without success. It was only when the ship was in a state of mutiny because of us that Eumolpus was able to broker an armistice with a formal treaty, according to which Tryphaena and Lichas were required to pay good cash in compensation if they sexually assaulted Giton or myself.

Festivity took over from hostility. Eumolpus entertained us with a satire about a certain widow from Ephesus, who was so faithful to the memory of her dead husband that she even followed him into his tomb and stayed there for days. The story was intended to show that although women may seem chaste at first, putting up austere defenses, they fall in love all too easily, and in the end forget their own children in their mad desire for a complete stranger. The sailors laughed at the story, but not Lichas who was reminded of his wife Hedyle. Tryphaena blushed with shame and buried her face in Giton's neck. My jealousy was rekindled at being excluded from their sweet caresses, though the dear boy was probably just being cautious not to upset a newly brokered armistice. Now a storm came on and when Lichas was asking me with hands outstretched for the stolen robe and rattle of the ship's protective goddess, he was suddenly carried off by the wind and disappeared into the sea. Tryphaena escaped safely into the ship's dinghy along with her family of slaves. Giton and I tied ourselves together to be united in the moment of

death. We drifted ashore in the storm-tossed wreck. Eumolpus, however, did not even notice what was happening, since he was inspired below deck writing out a poem on a huge parchment. We had to drag the frenetic poet out of the wreck. I also found Lichas' body lying on the beach and improvised on the theme of how human planning is regularly frustrated by Fortune. Later we burnt the corpse on a pyre and Eumolpus improvised an epigram.

We headed on foot for Croton, originally an illustrious and warlike Greek colony, but now a mere ghost town and obsessed with legacy hunting. It was Eumolpus' plan to pose as a shipwrecked African landowner with great estates, who had recently been bereft of his only son and was himself in bad health. We were to pose as his slaves. This was intended to trick the locals into providing for us in the hope of inheriting Eumolpus' alleged property. Here the gold from the villa of Lycurgus and the clothes I had stolen were useful to give Eumolpus the appearance of affluence. On the road to Croton, the poet recited his unfinished political epic about the civil war between Caesar and Pompey, the one he was inspired to compose on the storm-tossed ship. He effused this composition with whirling fluency until he finally stopped, just in time for us to arrive at our destination. Once there, we executed successfully the inspired plan of Eumolpus.

[Book 18?]. For a long time we lived in great luxury and stuffed ourselves with food, though like most outlaws I anxiously waited for the punishment I had in store. In Croton, where I had taken up the pseudonym Polyenos, a beautiful young matron, appropriately called Circe, solicited me. As I learned from Chrysis, her handmaiden and go-between, the young woman typically burned with desire for condemned criminals and flogged slaves. When we met in the grove by the shrine of Venus, I beheld a beauty even beyond the best marble statues of the great ancient sculptors. I was naturally eager to please her, but I found myself unable to have an erection. As it turned out, I couldn't even succeed with Giton. I tried various remedies before seeing Circe for the second time but I was still unable to please her. I went home in utter shame, having been not unjustly flogged and spat upon by her slaves. Though I failed in my attempt to cut off my useless and deceased member, at least I succeeded in verbally berating it. Afterwards, I felt a little embarrassed for talking to my penis, but as I reasoned to myself one can find epic precedents for this kind of behavior; ancient heroes never thought much of conversing with parts of their body, the heart for example, or the eyes.

It dawned on me that I might have been rendered impotent by the aphrodisiac Ascylos and I drank in such quantities during Quartilla's orgy back in the Greek city. So I checked with Giton to find out whether Ascylos, too, had abstained from lovemaking that night when he carried the boy off to his own bed while I was asleep. The way I figured it, this would furnish me with a proof. Giton swore that Ascylos had not forced him. Armed with this evidence for poisoning, I went to the temple of Priapus and kneeling on the threshold I apologized to the god for my crime, which, as I explained, was not all that serious, and had in fact been committed out of need, and, besides, with only one part of my body. Finally I promised him a sacrificial banquet when things got better. When I was still at the temple, Proselenos, an old hag who had tried before to cure my impotence, dragged me into the priestess' cell and started beating me for having excited the wrath of the gods against her. Oenothea, the priestess of the cult, now arrived in her cell, and upon hearing the story of my failure she declared that she could fix any problem with her magic, and mine especially if I only spent a night with her.

And so I became a guest in the priestess' squalid cell. She was in the middle of preparing a disgusting dinner when she fell off a chair, landed on the stove, toppled the pot and put out the fire. While she was away fetching fire at a neighbor's, the sacred geese of the temple attacked me, whose leader I heroically slew in a fierce battle. I feared that Oenothea would become angry at finding the goose dead and so I tried to leave, but as I was about to go, she returned with the fire. I pretended that I had been waiting for her there on the threshold. I told her what had happened and showed her the goose and she panicked at beholding such sacrilege. When Proselenos arrived she too acted as if I had killed my own father. They were completely calmed, however, as soon as I offered them two gold pieces for the goose. If you have money you can get away with anything, including murder. We now cooked the goose and drank wine, and the drunken and libidinous women tortured me with their useless medicine for impotence until I fled the temple with them in pursuit. Next, Chrysis, the maid of Circe, fell in love with me. She had obviously changed her mind from the time she told me that she only fancied upper-class men. But I was still useless for lovemaking.

A certain matron whose name was Philomela put her two children in the care of Eumolpus, ostensibly for their education but really to prostitute them for a share in his presumed legacy. Eumolpus straightway took advantage of the situation and copulated with the daughter, although he tried everything to preserve the pretense that he was in bad health. I tried

to have the son when he was peeping on his sister and Eumolpus, but found the god still against me.

Finally I told Eumolpus that Mercury, who often plays this role, had conveyed that particular part of my body back from the dead. I lifted my tunic and Eumolpus approved all. He was taken aback at first, but in order to better believe it, he handled the favor of the gods with both his hands. I warned him that the fortune-hunters were tired of his promises and that they were growing less generous. In his last will, Eumolpus stated that each one of his heirs, except we his freedmen, would be required to eat a piece of his dead body before receiving any inheritance. One of the legacy-hunters, Gorgias by name, showed himself willing to satisfy the condition ...

Part 3

Genre

3.1 Ancient Narrative *in personis*

3.1.1 The Form of the *Satyrica*

After the preceding three chapters, dedicated to the summary and reconstruction of the *Satyrica*, we are now ready to consider in more detail the narrative form, including its ancestry and place in the family of Greco-Roman literary forms. As we saw in the first two chapters, discussions of this topic in the scholarship usually begin from the premise that the *Satyrica* is constructed from two or more established primary forms, beginning with the prosimetric or “Menippean” satire and the Greco-Roman novel and continuing with a long list of known genres (ancient and modern) that are thought to have lent components to the amalgam that is the genre of the *Satyrica*. Accepted as a premise since the late nineteenth century, this difficult notion of a formal duality or plurality has had the consequence of undermining the unity of the work as a whole. If the genre is not one, but two or more, then the text belongs to no genuine genre, but is synthetic with respect to genre, whatever that may imply, and the efforts of the critic end up being directed at the hopeless task of finding a viable metaphor to describe this complex state of affairs, without losing sight of the fact that the *Satyrica* is a single composition, a single work of literature. In the supposed absence of another similar text, the *Satyrica* is compared by scholars with other very different works of literature and thus found to belong, in terms of genre, to the same or a similar category as the “comparison text” of choice for each scholar. As we have seen above, the language and arguments used to forge such connections between dissimilar texts are often ingenious.

And yet the *Satyrica* has a logic of its own and shows distinct formal qualities. Its distinctive character is not, however, to be found in the mixture of prose and poetry or the work’s common traits with the Greek novel, mime or indeed in its common traits with other genres, although these are certainly important features. The one distinct feature of the *Satyrica* that outweighs all others is, of course, the fact that Encolpius’ narrative is conducted in the “first person”, or to use my own terminology, the narrative he delivers is his personal recollection. Here is a clear formal feature which has surprisingly not featured much so far in the discussions of the formal characteristics or the genre of the *Satyrica*. More specifically, Encolpius’ personal recollection

includes a series of extended and repeated narrative impersonations which, as we saw in section 1.2, warrant our defining it as *narratio in personis*, based on the definition of that term in ancient rhetorical manuals. As we shall see this formal quality of the work is an identifying signature, which squarely places the *Satyrica* within a single known ancient genre. In modern times it has been known since the late nineteenth century that the *Satyrica* could well be classified with similar extant and lost works. But through a great effort of scholarship, motivated by an ideology strictly speaking irrelevant to the understanding of ancient literature, our text has been divorced from its proper genre. A single text with no equal is a generic problem, but two or more texts that share qualities to such a degree that they begin to possess generic sameness, that is the norm in ancient literature and what we call a genre. But before we look at the arguments in support of the classification of the *Satyrica* as Milesian fiction, let us look at how, so far, the “first person” form has been interpreted in the scholarship.

3.1.2 Understanding the Ancient First Person Narrator

Interpreting the narrative form of the *Satyrica* in modern times has been made difficult by excessive analogy with the modern novel. The history of this interpretation can be traced at least back to 1889 when Elimar Klebs made attempts to describe Encolpius’ tone and narrative stance in the *Satyrica* by comparison with contemporary realistic novels. What may seem surprising to progressive classicists, who are prone to lament the innate conservatism of the discipline, is that from the very beginning of the modern reception of the *Satyrica* critical concepts developed for the study of the modern novel have been prominent. Over a century ago Klebs employed critical terms from the emerging science of modern narratology to advance his once influential thesis that the *Satyrica* was an “almost” modern realistic novel of the “Ich-Roman” type, only with an epic structure borrowed from the *Odyssey* which supplied it with esthetic and artistic unity.³⁸⁷ The purpose of the parodic comparisons of the protagonist’s experience with the lot of epic heroes, according to Klebs, was to express, by way of irony, the narrator’s awareness of his pathetic humiliation. This irony was supposedly both sophisticated and self-conscious and resembled the complicated narrative posturing often assumed in modern realistic novels.

A decade later Klebs’ interpretation was countered by Heinze, whose understanding of the narrative structure of the *Satyrica* was considerably

³⁸⁷ Klebs 1889, 631f.

more rooted in Greco-Roman literary history.³⁸⁸ Heinze revises the modern conception of the stance of Encolpius as an ironic self-conscious reflection upon his own humiliation. He sees the self-deprecation of the narrator as part of the ancient comic stance. He compares the narrative stance of Encolpius to the narrators of the Greek erotic fictions and observes major differences: whereas the tone of the latter shows that the trials and tribulations of its heroes are meant to be taken “very seriously” (*bitter ernst*), the work of Petronius sports an attitude which implies that whatever pain and sorrow is endured by Encolpius and his comrades is “fully deserved” (*verdienen sie reichlich*), and “can only, and should only arouse laughter in the reader” (*die der Leser nur zum Lachen reizen können und sollen*). The difference between these two narrative types, he claims, is akin to the difference in drama between tragedy and comedy or farce. An even closer parallel would be tragedy and satyr plays, or tragic parody. Although Heinze showed an understanding of the problems involved in determining the tone and stance of the narrator, his effort to define the difference between the *Satyrice* and the five fully extant Greek novels never advanced much beyond saying that Encolpius’ pose was comic and parodic in comparison with them, and in order to make his argument more convincing he was certainly led to exaggerate the “seriousness” of tone in the Greek novels.

The problem resurfaced with a vengeance in the scholarship of the sixties and the seventies of the twentieth century, a period particularly interested in questions of psychology and character. Veyne, Sullivan, Walsh, Rankin and George saw Encolpius as an inconsistent and fragmented personality, who was further complicated by being merely a “transparent mask” for the historical author, who accordingly was the real narrator.³⁸⁹

It was as an attempt to reconcile “the discrepancies in Encolpius’ character” and to clearly differentiate the narrator’s persona from that of the historical author that Roger Beck presented his study of the narrative structure of the *Satyrice*. As in the previous century the discipline of modern narratology is the theoretical background, and Beck explicitly refers to the new and improved formulations in this field, especially as they had then recently been applied to the Ancient Novel by Tomas Hägg in his *Narrative Technique in Ancient Greek Romances* (Stockholm 1971). In Beck’s words “[the] key to the solution is [...] a realization that in dealing with Encolpius one is concerned not with a single person but with two. Not only are they two distinct persons separated by what is presumably a considerable span of time (the

³⁸⁸ Heinze 1899, 503.

³⁸⁹ Veyne 1964, 301–324; Sullivan 1968, 119; Walsh 1970, 81; Rankin 1971, 19; George 1966, 349f.

narrator is looking back on his own *past* adventures) but they are also two very *different* characters.”³⁹⁰ After his exposition of the structural relationship between narrator and protagonist in the *Satyrice*, Beck proceeds to establish the sophistication of the narrator versus the naïveté of the protagonist.

As it happened, it was this further elaboration of the thesis which would be incorrectly construed as the touchstone of the validity of his basic description of the narrative structure. In an article from 1987 which directly addresses Beck’s proposed solution, F. Jones at first appears to accept the basic formal distinction between Encolpius *qua* narrator and Encolpius *qua* protagonist. But then he proceeds to cast doubt on the extent of the maturity and sophistication of the narrator, although he, too, sees him as having abandoned the bombastic rhetorical style of his youth. Nevertheless, Jones concludes by doubting the extent of the gap between the two *Encolpii*, as a cautionary measure after what he considers Beck’s failure to positively define the complicated difference between their characters: “[s]ometimes [...] the narrator seems to get so involved in the act of narration that his distance [from the protagonist] vanishes.”³⁹¹ Instead of the formal difference between narrator and protagonist, we are left with a “clear connection between the narrator and his former self”, and a “solidity and continuity to his character”, though some development in his personality is noted.³⁹² In a sense this conclusion is a natural consequence of the modern method and premise of such studies. Once you begin to read the *Satyrice* with a method developed primarily for the study of the *Bildungsroman*, perhaps the most obvious type of modern “first person” novel, certain ideas and assumptions are necessarily carried over from the “comparison text.” Without that association, the critical issue ceases to be the demonstration of character development or maturity, through pinpointing those character traits of the narrator which will put him at a secure psychological distance from the protagonist. This formulation, moreover, risks confusing psychological distance, or difference in mood and personality, with temporal and situational distance, or difference in *personae*. Despite the inviting etymology, the ancient rhetorical term ‘persona’ is a very different concept from the modern psychological term ‘personality’.³⁹³

Perhaps sensing that this approach was ultimately an interpretive dead end, Niall W. Slater proposed a fresh start by introducing a brand of reader-

³⁹⁰ Beck 1973, 43. The arguments are further elaborated in Beck 1975.

³⁹¹ Jones 1987, 819.

³⁹² Jones 1987, 819.

³⁹³ On this topic, see Gill 1990 (ed.) and Gill 1996.

oriented criticism into the study of the *Satyrica*.³⁹⁴ His *Reading Petronius* (1990), a book which is both neat and attractive in presentation, argues for a complete fusion of narrator and protagonist. This uncompromising stance may, perhaps, be seen as a logical consequence of the premise which he adopts for his study, for if the reader is the ultimate reference, in matters of temporal distance as well as in other respects, the only meaningful present in narrative is the moment when the reader casts his eyes upon a particular page, and the only meaningful past is the reader's recollection of pages read. In essence, this idea stresses the reader's linear experience of the text, when first read, as radically different from what happens in the reader's mind during a subsequent reading, when it would under normal circumstances be known where the story as a whole is leading.³⁹⁵ When applied, however, by Slater to the incomplete text of the *Satyrica*, the concept of the "first reading" is transformed into something akin to an argument *ex silentio* to the effect that since the modern reader has not "so far" experienced the prologue of the *Satyrica*, where we must assume the narration of Encolpius was introduced, there remains no reason for him to distinguish between the present of the narrating act and the past of the story:

The notion of a split in Encolpius between narrator and actor, old persona and young persona, [is not] supported by anything the reader has so far experienced in the text. Even if there were in the lost beginning something to set up the notion of Encolpius recounting his past adventures, we should expect some reinforcement of this temporal perspective in the text. There is none.³⁹⁶

Slater's attempt to level out the temporal dimensions of the *Satyrica* leads *ipso facto* to the obliteration of the narrator, which leaves the protagonist alone, as it were, acting out the narrative. From here there is a direct route to interpretations of Petronius' text as the "narrative equivalent" of other media, such as a play on the stage or a movie on the screen.

Such interpretations, fresh and interesting though they are, clash with the basic premise of narrative form as understood by ancient and modern students. As Gérard Genette has shown in his admirably comprehensive discussion of the moment of narration with respect to the time of the story itself, there are four basic types of narrating acts to be reckoned with:

³⁹⁴ Slater 1990, 46–7.

³⁹⁵ Slater 1990, 140 n.2, acknowledges his debt to Winkler's discussion of reading and critical method, especially the notion of "first reading". Winkler's reader oriented criticism is most evident in his *Auctor & Actor* (1985), a study of Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*.

³⁹⁶ Slater 1990, 47 with n.26.

subsequent (the classical position of the past-tense narrative, undoubtedly far and away the most frequent); *prior* (predictive narrative, generally in the future tense, but not prohibited from being conjugated in the present [...]); *simultaneous* (narrative in the present contemporaneous with the action); and *interpolated* (between the moments of the action).³⁹⁷

From this schema it is evident that a real fusion of narrator and protagonist can only occur when the time of narration and the time of the story itself are “simultaneous”. It is easy to demonstrate that the narrative structure of the *Satyrica* is unrelated to this avant-garde modern type. The dominance of the preterite in the *Satyrica*’s narrative clearly excludes it from being identical in structure with Robbe-Grillet’s early novels, or the so-called French “New Novel”. In these works the narrator *is* the protagonist, and literally tells the story as it happens. Furthermore, since the *Satyrica* is not an interrupted past tense narrative, such as the “novel by letters” or the “private diary”, nor in any sense predicting future events, we are unsurprisingly left with only one slot to fit it in, namely the classical past-tense narrative.

Much has sometimes been made of the “fact” that the narrator of the *Satyrica* never alludes to what lies ahead in the work.³⁹⁸ Not only is this claim discrepant with the evidence, as is shown by the following statement close to the middle of the Cena episode: *nec adhuc sciebamus nos in medio lautitiarum, quod aiunt, clivo laborare* (“we didn’t yet know that we were struggling, as they say, half way up the slope of delicacies”, 47.8), but the very assumption that such proleptic statements are necessary in narrative in the form of personal recollections is not well founded. They are indeed rare in the Greco-Roman erotic fictions as a whole—if we exclude indirect proleptic statements in prophetic oracles and dreams—and this is one of only two in the extant *Satyrica*.³⁹⁹ Anticipating what comes later is hardly a requisite of any story, although the figure may of course prove useful in certain narrative circumstances. From the standpoint of narrative form, the preterite in the *Satyrica* maintains throughout an unmistakable temporal gap between the time of narration and the time when the events of the story supposedly took place. Even where the narrator uses the present tense for narrating past events (a figure which momentarily creates an impression that the two are existing at the same moment), this does not constitute a true fusion of the

³⁹⁷ Genette 1972, 217.

³⁹⁸ Jones 1987, 816; and Slater 1990, 46, who concurs in this view.

³⁹⁹ Another technically proleptic statement in the *Satyrica* is 70.8, *pudet referre quae secuntur* (“One is ashamed to tell what follows”), see discussion in 1.2.4.

two *personae* of Encolpius.⁴⁰⁰ This use of the present tense to intensify the discursive report is part and parcel of the art of narration and does not affect the basic rule of the preterite.

Most recently critics have returned to the narratological analysis of Beck's article (1973), and have therefore made renewed attempts at understanding the psychology of the *Satyrica*'s "first person" form. Gareth Schmeling defines the tone and stance of Encolpius as that of the "glorious confessor" who from some psychological compulsion, defined in modern times, admits to crimes that he hasn't committed.⁴⁰¹ For Gian Biagio Conte the character of Encolpius is deeply rooted in the mandarin educational system of antiquity, which has made of him a literary "mythomaniac" who identifies so strongly with the artistic representations of mythological heroes that he loses all touch with the reality of the present day.⁴⁰² However, as we have seen in section 1.2, the term *persona* accommodates conceptually not just the psychological character, but even more the social type and situation (including the audience to be addressed) in which the speaker finds himself at the moment of uttering the speech. When considered thus, the difference between narrator and protagonist in the *Satyrica* does not depend on our success or failure in diagnosing the psychological conditions of these present and past selves of the same individual.

There is a much more fundamental and pragmatic difference: While Encolpius *qua* narrator is telling his audience a story from memory, and pretends at least to remember almost everything that has happened to him within a certain period of his past, Encolpius *qua* protagonist is an agent stuck in a given moment in time, both completely ignorant of what lies ahead, and generally not very resourceful in dealing with people and events. There need be no doubt that the recollections of Encolpius, towards the end, reached their conclusion by picking up theme phrases or, at least, ideas from the prologue in order to resume the present occasion of narration. The form of the classical travelogue, which originates in written Greco-Roman literature with Odysseus' Phaeacian tales, dictates that Encolpius survived to return and tell his tale; and it is likely, although impossible to prove, that at the end of our Latin *Satyrica* our "hero" reached Rome, the most obvious location of his narrative performance in front of a recognizably Roman audience.⁴⁰³

⁴⁰⁰ As Jones 1987, 819, seems to indicate. Dowden 1982, 29–30 and 45n., argues for a similar fusion of Lucius, the *auctor*, and Lucius, the *actor*, in Apuleius' *Asinus Aureus*.

⁴⁰¹ Schmeling 1994/1995.

⁴⁰² Conte 1996.

⁴⁰³ The only exception to this rule is the narrative of Achilles Tatius' Clitophon, who notori-

In Greco-Roman prose fictions, as a rule, the prologue is used to provide important information about the external circumstances under which the story is told, and thus we most sorely miss this part of the *Satyrice*. In the prologues to the two fully extant ancient personal recollections, Clitophon's narrative in Achilles Tatius and Lucius' narrative in the Latin *Metamorphoses*, the narrators are clearly presented as distinct from their younger selves. Both the time and location of the narrative versus the events of the story leave no doubt that the narration of the story takes place after the events are fully over. In Lucius' case, the Latin of the narrative further distances his telling of the story from the events themselves, as they supposedly took place in a Greek-speaking environment.

3.1.3 Recollection vs. Action

Narratives which take the form of recollection differ in one important way from narratives in which the relation of the storyteller is less clearly defined with respect to the characters and events of the story. Since a recollection narrative is based on the memory of one of the characters, it cannot, without accounting for it especially, introduce material which was not available to that person as data at the time.⁴⁰⁴ Although this may seem to put great constraint on the narrator, there is a hidden advantage. By divulging to the reader no more information than he himself had to act on at a given moment, the narrator leaves the reader to speculate continuously about the meaning and direction that events are taking. This, in turn, makes the reader more likely to appreciate the complexities of the moral and practical problems which the hero must face, and thus creates an audience disposition advantageous to the narrator, whose past follies are often present liabilities.⁴⁰⁵ The audience cannot judge the protagonist on the basis of information that they do not have, which assures a fairer trial for the hero (and therefore narrator) who is necessarily under their scrutiny.⁴⁰⁶

ously does not return to the initial moment of narration. However, Clitophon is from the point of view of narrative form a subordinate narrator, since the "author" introduces him before he begins his story, a feature which made problematic the full return to the initial moment. See Most 1989, 114–33.

⁴⁰⁴ See Reardon 1994, 81–82, whose analysis of the narrative method of Achilles Tatius, i.e., of Clitophon's narrative within that work, reveals the same basic structure.

⁴⁰⁵ Heinze 1915 speaks of "a feeling of uneasy tension" (*ein Gefühl unruhiger Spannung*) caused by the restrictions imposed on the authorial perspective during the delivery of the personal account of Aeneas in the *Aeneid*, books 2–3.

⁴⁰⁶ See Most 1989, 114–33. Recollections are, of course, related to such genres as formal

In Encolpius' love story, the narrator's continuing blindness with respect to his own obsessive behavior, not just towards Giton but also towards those who threaten to take him away, could potentially diminish the *fides* of his audience. For example, a moral critic of Encolpius' account could argue that what introduces the many rivals for Giton's love is not at all the boy's treacherous nature, but Encolpius' own sexual opportunism (at least in the cases of Tryphaena and Ascyltos). He is simply hypocritical, and violates that fidelity which he expects in Giton and sets as the model of their relationship. Both narrator and protagonist remain quite oblivious to this dissonance. Indeed, from a modern psychological standpoint, it's one of the respects in which Encolpius remains immature.

If we adopt the point of view of reading oriented criticism, the style of narration practiced by Encolpius is a deliberate gradual feeding of information to the audience as the story progresses, never making them privy to his full knowledge about the outcome of events, until each scene has been narrated fully and in detail. We might call this the principle of *adhuc*.⁴⁰⁷ An example of this would be when the narrator represents his youthful self as proclaiming an emotionally involved speech about the human condition over an unknown corpse he finds on a beach: *adhuc tamquam ignotum deflebam* ("I was still crying over him as somebody I did not know", 115.11). There is, however, no absolute necessity compelling the narrator to do this, and as we have seen, at least once in the *Satyrica* the narrator makes an exception which proves the rule (47.8). Here, exactly as the narrator says, the young protagonist and his friends did not know at that time that they were only half way through the dinner party, although by the time he tells the story Encolpius knows this full well, because he has long since left that dining room and thereafter besides done many other things (some of which we can read about in the latter part of the extant *Satyrica*). At this particular point Encolpius uncharacteristically wishes the audience to share in his knowledge of the hero's future, which is nevertheless in the narrator's past, since this knowledge can be used to give a sense of the excessive quantity of food offered at the party. The guests were already bursting, when half of the food was served. Limited as this information may be, it still constitutes a revealing exception from the constraints on narrative information in the *Satyrica*, an exception that proves the rule.

Just as the narrator can, technically, leap ahead into the future of the protagonist (at least into that part of it which is still in the narrator's past), he

apologies and the defendant's speech.

⁴⁰⁷ Cf. the use of the adverb *adhuc*, 'still', in 11.2, 13.1, 17.1, 33.3, 54.3, 70.4, 96.3, 99.5, 106.2, 113.7.

can also jump back in time and refer to a past which is shared both by himself and the protagonist. We might call this the principle of the *paulo ante*. An example of this would be when the narrator represents his youthful self as standing on the beach over that same corpse after he recognizes that it is the body of his enemy Lichas: *agnovique terribilem paulo ante et implacabilem Licham pedibus meis paene subjectum* (“and I recognized Lichas, who a short while ago (*paulo ante*) had been so frightful and unforgiving, now lying prostrate, as it were, before my feet”, 115.11).⁴⁰⁸ The ability of the narrator to leave the present of the protagonist and go back in time seems, however, less interesting than his leaps into the future, because it does not distinguish him from the protagonist, who can and does accomplish such feats as well (115.12). It is important to note that here the phrase *paulo ante* refers to a point in time just before the protagonist’s present, and yet it is the narrator and not the protagonist who is speaking. The fixation on the past is the rule in the classical past-tense narrative. In modern narratology this obvious fixation on a particular character and moment in the past is usually referred to as a “point of view”, or as “focalization” through that character, both of which are metaphors taken from the modern art of photography.

To observe directly the contrast between young Encolpius’ continuous heuristic progress from ignorance to knowledge as opposed to the narrator’s prior knowledge of the outcome of events, we can look at the passage, shortly after the opening of the extant *Satyrical*, where the narrator tells us that he left Agamemnon reciting in the portico and ran after Ascyrtos, whom he suspected of not being the best of friends. Exhausted and completely lost in an unknown city, as a last resort, he approached an old street vendor to ask for directions, not truly expecting that she could tell him where he lived:

“rogo” inquam “mater, numquid scis ubi ego habitem?” delectata est illa *urbanitate tam stulta* et “quidni sciam?” inquit consurrexitque et coepit me praecedere. divinam ego putabam et subinde ut in locum secretiorem venimus, centonem *anus urbana* reiecit et “hic” inquit “debes habitare”. cum ego negarem me agnoscere domum, video quosdam inter titulos nudasque meretrices furtim spatiantes. tarde, immo iam sero intellexi me in fornicem esse deductum. execratus itaque aniculae insidias operui caput et per medium lupanar fugere coepi.⁴⁰⁹

⁴⁰⁸ Cf. the use of the phrase *paulo ante*, ‘a short while ago’, in 16.3, 49.3, 74.5, 80.8, 96.1, 137.12.

⁴⁰⁹ *Sat.* 7.1–4.

I said, “Listen, mother, you wouldn’t happen to know where I live?”—She, *charmed with such stupid wit*, answered: “And why shouldn’t I?”—then she stood up and began to lead the way. I took her to be some sort of apparition, and when we came to a locale more out of the way, *the humorous old woman* drew back the curtain—and said: “This should be where you live.”—While I was saying that I didn’t recognize the place as my home, I see some men tip-toeing furtively amid written signs and naked whores. Slowly (or rather now when it was too late) I understood that I had been led to a whorehouse. I immediately cursed the trickery of the old lady, covered my head, and took to flight through the center of the bordello.

The fundamentally different cognitive status of narrator and protagonist emerges clearly from this recollection of a past incident (the present tense in *video* is without temporal significance). The narrator’s description of the old woman’s reaction to the question, and especially the mocking qualification of that question as *urbanitas tam stulta*, signals that the mood and understanding of the narrator is just the opposite of that of the desperate and helpless protagonist. The split continues: While young Encolpius like an epic hero thinks the old woman is a god in human form (*divina*) because she knows where he lives and is willing to show him the way, the older Encolpius knows full well that something else than divine protection or human altruism is behind the apparently good deed. His knowledge is signaled by the anticipatory qualification of the old woman as *urbana*. The contrast between the absolute naïveté of the one and the knowing amusement of the other could not be clearer. The realization of what is happening comes painfully slowly to the youth, and only gradually does he fully recognize that he is being led on and insulted (*tardo, iam sero intellexi*). For some reason, however, we detect little or no resentment in the narrator’s account of this humiliating incident. There seems rather to be in him a clownish enjoyment of how easily he himself was taken in and how silly he was to trust that old practical joker.

Another passage, this time from the *Cena*, provides further illustration of the gap between the narrator’s knowledge and the protagonist’s ignorance of events in the future of the latter. This passage is the narrator’s account of his own puzzled reaction to one of the many deceptive articles of food offered at Trimalchio’s table:

[...] gustantibus adhuc nobis repositorium allatum est cum corbe, in quo gallina erat lignea patentibus in orbem alis, quales esse solent quae incu-

bant ova. accessere continuo duo servi et symphonia strepente scrutari paleam coeperunt erutaque subinde pavonina ova divisere convivis. convertit ad hanc scaenam Trimalchio vultum et “amici,” ait “pavonis ova gallinae iussi supponi. et mehercules timeo ne iam concepti sint; temp-temus tamen, si adhuc sorbilia sunt.” accipimus nos cochlearia non minus selibras pendentia *ovaque ex farina pingui figurata pertundimus*. ego quidem paene proieci partem meam, nam videbatur mihi iam in pullum coisse. deinde ut audivi veterem convivam: “hic nescio quid boni debet esse”, persecutus putamen manu pinguissimam ficedulam inveni piperato vitello circumdatam.⁴¹⁰

... we were still busy with the hors d’oeuvres, when a tray was brought in with a basket on it, in which there was a hen made of wood, spreading out her wings as they do when they are sitting. The music grew loud: two slaves at once came up and then hunted in the straw. Peacock’s eggs were pulled out and handed to the guests. Trimalchio turned his head towards this performance, and said: “I gave orders, my friends, that peacock’s eggs should be put under a common hen, and by Hercules I’m afraid they might now be addled. However, let us see if they can still be sucked.” We took our spoons, half-a-pound in weight at least, and hammered at the eggs *made out of flour and fat*. I almost threw away my portion. I thought a peachick had already formed. But hearing a practiced diner say, “What treasure have we here?”, I poked through the shell with my finger, and found a very fat fig-pecker, rolled up in spiced yolk of egg.

I quote these two passages in full, because the linear experience of reading them is not easily described and must be experienced. Again we notice that the narrator communicates the essential facts to the audience (*ovaque ex farina pingui figurata pertundimus*) several lines before the protagonist has found out that the eggs are not real. Once this information has been divulged, dramatic irony kicks in and the painfully slow understanding of the hero is made all the more evident. This is clearly the intention, as can be seen from the phrase: “I almost threw away my portion,” which self-consciously exaggerates young Encolpius’ clownishness beyond what actually happened at the time.

It would try the reader’s patience if we kept repeating the obvious, and I fear that I have demonstrated all too well that the strongest argument against

⁴¹⁰ *Sat.* 33.3–8.

the close scrutiny of narrative technique is how fundamentally mechanical the method is revealed to be when applied to a specific literary text. In fact, the method does not allow us to get much beyond its *a priori* premise, unless we introduce the question of literary genre.

3.1.4 Narrative *in personis* as the Mark of Genre

Surprising as it is, the scholars who have most studied the implications and formal features of the “personal” narrative in the *Satyrica* rarely bring this quality to bear on their discussion of the literary genre. Moreover, it is a common assumption that all “personal recollection” narratives are essentially the same, which justifies the frequent comparison of the work with modern texts which display some features in common with it. As we showed in section 1.2, however, the “personal recollection” narrative of Encolpius is significantly different from any modern narrative, and modern novels (as well as the method developed for reading them, modern narratology) are therefore of very limited use as “comparison texts” for the student of the *Satyrica*.

What remains is the fact that the closest analogous literary work in the whole of extant literature, and one that has almost exactly the same narrative form as the *Satyrica*, is, and always has been, Apuleius’ *Metamorphoses*. Other long “first person” narratives in ancient epic or fiction do not display the same structure, and they are always subordinate to a main narrative which is conducted in the name of the author. Although the novel of Achilles Tatius is practically a personal recollection narrative, if we leave out the initial introduction of the narrator by the author, that text does not display the variety and extent of impersonations of subordinate narrators so peculiar to the *Satyrica* and the *Metamorphoses*.⁴¹¹ Let us remember that in the *Sa-*

⁴¹¹ Which is not to say that Achilles Tatius has not been influenced by the same structure. Clitophon’s own introduction of his narrative, “you are poking up a wasp’s nest of narrative, my life has been very storied” (1.2, “Σμήνος ἀνεγείρεις, εἶπε, λόγων· τὰ γὰρ ἐμὰ μύθοις ἔοικε”), includes the mention of a plurality of λόγοι and μύθοι which is reminiscent of the *fabulae* of the Latin works. However, no such plurality of stories and impersonations is offered in the narrative of Clitophon. In Achilles Tatius we do have occasional separate stories and speeches (the slave’s report of Charicles’ death in 1.12; Satyros’ Aesopic fable in 2.21–22; Menelaos’ love story, in 2.34, followed by the debate on the relative merits of male- and female-directed love, in 2.35–38; Clinias’ account of himself in 5.9–10, and his court speech in 7.9, and Thersandros’ reply in 7.11; and finally, the priest’s account of the secrets of the syrinx, in 8.6, and the speeches at the end of that book), but these are mostly short and more closely related to the intrigue of Clitophon’s and Leukippe’s love story.

tyrica this elastic and yet highly structured genre can accommodate the long poem of Eumolpus, the so-called *Bellum Civile*, and in the *Metamorphoses* it can accommodate the long fable of the old hag, the so-called *Cupid and Psyche*. As a mark of genre, the perfect match of the structure of personal recollection *in personis*, common to both works, should be viewed as more reliable than the prosimetry of the *Satyrica*, which we know too little about, and is found in too many types of works to be a helpful marker of genre. Recently Gian Biagio Conte has reiterated the futility of assuming an identification between prosimetry and “Menippean satire”, an identification which presupposes that prosimetry is a reliable marker of one and only one genre, and not a mode of discourse possibly common to several literary types, as seems the obvious conclusion to draw especially since the discovery of the Iolaos and Tinouphis papyri.⁴¹² By replacing the prosimetry with the narrative form as the identifying generic feature of the *Satyrica* we accomplish nothing less than to eliminate the fruitless notion of generic duality or plurality which has paralyzed the study of this text and led to its continued disintegration, as it were, in the hands of scholars who have earnestly attempted to make sense of the problem. I stress that by classifying the *Satyrica* and the *Metamorphoses* in the same genre I am not attempting to perpetuate the nineteenth-century notion of a Roman national novel, to be contrasted to a Greek one (see below for a full discussion of this topic). As a matter of fact it is my intention to argue that the genre is as Greek as were the lost Μεταμορφώσεις, the Greek text adapted by Apuleius when he wrote the Latin *Metamorphoses*.

Before we go any further, however, we need to lay out the narrative model in the *Metamorphoses*, just as we did for the *Satyrica* at the beginning of our discussion of the form. As before, the name/mask of the main narrator is marked by caps and the names/masks of the subordinate narrators by quotation marks. This work of course is preserved complete and so the thread of the narrative is neither broken at the beginning nor the end.

LUCIUS (1.1–5) — “Aristomenes” — LUCIUS (1.20–2.5) — “Byrrhena” — LUCIUS (2.5–6) — “Lucius” — LUCIUS (2.7–11) — “Lucius” — LUCIUS (2.13) — “Milo” — LUCIUS (2.15–21) — “Thelyphron” — LUCIUS (2.31–3.3) — “anonymous prosecutor” — LUCIUS (3.4) — “Lucius” — LUCIUS (3.8–14) — “Photis” — LUCIUS (3.19–4.8) — “anonymous robber” — LUCIUS (4.22–27) — “old woman” — LUCIUS (6.25–28) — “Charite” — LUCIUS (6.29–31)

⁴¹² Conte 1996, 140f.

— “anonymous robber” — LUCIUS (6.32–7.1) — “anonymous robber” — LUCIUS (7.2–5) — “Haemus the Thracian” — LUCIUS (7.10–20) — “boy in charge of the ass” — LUCIUS (7.22) — “one of the countrymen” — LUCIUS (7.24–27) — “boy’s mother” — LUCIUS (7.28–8.1) — “Charite’s slave” — LUCIUS (8.15–19) — “old man” — LUCIUS (8.21–9.16) — “old hag” — LUCIUS (9.22–24) — “baker” — LUCIUS (9.26–10.8) — “physician” — LUCIUS (10.12–14) — “brothers” — LUCIUS (10.15–11.1) — “Lucius” — LUCIUS (11.3–4) — “Isis in Lucius’ dream” — LUCIUS (11.7–14) — “priest of Isis” — LUCIUS (11.16–24) — “Lucius” — LUCIUS (11.25–29) — “Osiris in Lucius’ dream” — LUCIUS (11.30).

As we can see the general rule is that the subordinate and more or less separate stories told by Lucius in the *Metamorphoses* are narrated *in personis*. A few, however, are inspired simply by the places visited by Lucius and in rare instances he does not bother, apart from associating them with a particular spot on the journey, to account for their origin. Here there is no impersonation. An example of this would be the brief story of the bailiff’s punishment for adultery (8.22); another is the retelling in Lucius’ own person of the tale of the cuckold and the corn-jar, but this one he heard in the inn of the town where it supposedly happened (9.5–7). The story of the crazed estate-owner is also told by Lucius in his own voice on the basis of an eyewitness report he heard in the past (9.35–38). Another such case is a crime recorded by Lucius (10.2–12), although that story does feature the impersonated speeches of the physician (10.8–9; 11), despite Lucius’ statement that in his manger he was not in a position to hear the main speeches of the prosecutor and defendant, and so could not write them down from memory for the enjoyment of his reader (10.7). And finally the story of the crime of the condemned woman (10.23–28), although said to have been “heard” by Lucius, is similarly told without impersonation. All of these, however, are woven into the travelogue of Lucius and in one way or another come to his attention while he is on the road.

Lucius with his long asinine ears is like a vacuum cleaner that eagerly sucks up the “ancient smutz” he encounters on the trip, or at least such has been the opinion of generations of concerned moral critics.⁴¹³ His character-

⁴¹³ A rare appraisal of the “antike Schmutz” in the *Satyrice* is offered by Nietzsche in a posthumously published fragment, where the philosopher, after comparing favorably the experience of reading the *Satyrice* to that of reading the New Testament, poses the following question: “*ist nicht der antike Schmutz noch mehr werth als diese ganze kleine anmaaßliche Christen-Weisheit und -Muckerei?*” See *Nachgelassene Fragmente; Herbst 1887 bis März*

istic “curiosity” is therefore not just a moral fault, it is also what makes him fit for his role of gathering this store-house of narratives to record for his reader (9.15). The scrupulous reader in turn is assumed to be just as inquisitive as Lucius. This is clearly indicated by his initial promise to caress the reader’s ears with a delightful string of stories. As narrator and writer of the *Metamorphoses* Lucius represents his past self as having been constantly on the look-out for material that could later be used for the book (10.2). As he relates how he rushed back to the house of Milo to meet his fate at the hand of the witches, he represents himself as excitedly uttering these words to himself: “O Lucius, come now, [...] the opportunity you have been waiting for has arrived; you can have your heart’s fill of marvelous stories, as you have always wanted.”⁴¹⁴ It would appear that he is not so much driven by a quest for the forbidden knowledge of magical transformations as simply hungry for stories.

A certain pact is established by Lucius with his reader from the very start. Not a serious contract this one, but a game where the rules are that Lucius can lie as much as he wants, so long as he respects certain norms of conduct. One of these rules is that he must roughly account for the source of his stories, since this is seen to be a sort of guarantee of their authenticity. At one point in the narrative Lucius as an ass is confined within the walls of a bakery, and yet he claims that despite the limitations put on his freedom for snooping around, he still was able to gather important material. This calls for Lucius’ effort to tackle an anticipated protest from the reader that he has perhaps broken the pact and is now freely inventing stories, instead of merely reporting what he heard on his travels (9.30). By raising this issue the narrator re-establishes the rules of the game and reaffirms his commitment to the general constraints on information that apply in recollection narratives.

If we take a brief look at how ancient narrators of fiction account for their relationship with the characters and material of their stories, we see that a variety of well defined stances was developed. While writers of modern fiction are usually under little constraint to account for the source of their stories, the ancient fabricator of fiction felt that he owed the reader an explanation. The author of the *Apocolocyntosis*, which takes place in heaven and hell, somehow had to account for his knowledge about affairs in places which were naturally inaccessible to him. He therefore wittily pretended to have a “source” for his information in a man, an historical individual, who had become notorious in the times of Caligula for swearing to the senate that

1888 10 [93] (213); in Colli and Montinari 1970, 8:2, 175–6.

⁴¹⁴ *Met.* 2.6, “O Luci, [...] *Habes exoptatam occasionem et voto diutino poteris fabulis miris explere pectus.*”

he saw Julia, the emperor's sister, ascend to heaven. Lucian, in the prologue to his freely invented *Vera Historia*, similarly exposes the convention in a meta-literary joke. He starts by expounding the long tradition in Greek letters of mendacious story-telling, founded by Homer in the *Odyssey*, and then makes the confession once and for all that the subsequent story presented in the form of an autobiographical travelogue is pure invention in accordance with this venerable tradition! Everywhere in ancient fiction we meet with this requirement to acquire a license or establish a source for the fictional information.⁴¹⁵ Mysterious documents, found in an ancient tomb, are said to guarantee the story truthfulness, as in Antonius Diogenes' tale *The Wonders Beyond Thule*. The same trick is used by "Cornelius Nepos", the Latin "translator" of the contemporary Phrygian history of the Trojan War written in the hand of one Dares who actually fought in that famous conflict. Somewhat related is the discovery in *Daphnis and Chloë* of a pictorial history, an authentic relief that illustrates how everything happened, the narrative of Longus being simply the interpretation of the pictures offered by a local guide. Less obvious and more conceited are those story-tellers who hide behind the imposing authority (and general lack of accountability) of ancient historians—*quis unquam ab historico iuratores egit?* (*Apoc.* 1)—as does Chariton in his *Callirhoë*, which might be seen as a fictional digression from Thucydides' account of the Sicilian expedition. The inventor of such tricks (according to Lucian) was Homer himself, and if we look at the epic convention, we see that there it is the assistance of omniscient divine Muses which guarantees the accuracy of the story. When particularly detailed passages occur, the goddesses are re-invoked in order to forestall doubt or disbelief among the audience. In more pragmatic ways *memory* (the mythological mother of the Muses) is also the source of narrative authority in autobiographies, real or fictive. When Encolpius, Lucius and Clitophon casually refer to their memory during the narration of their stories, this too is an attempt to induce the reader to accept the account as real and reliable.

But as eager as he may be to fill his mind with stories, Lucius in the *Metamorphoses* is not interested in just any story, but has a clear preference for the titillating, wondrous and horrifying (2.6). Thus he does not like his mean-spirited host, a staunch realist who is completely free of either adventurous or entertaining impulses. In an easily recognizable example of Menippean humor, Lucius describes Milo's unsatisfying, loquacious and

⁴¹⁵ Even Odysseus must account for his information about what was spoken by gods in heaven: "This I heard from fair-haired Calypso, and she said that she herself had heard it from the messenger Hermes" (*Od.* 12.389f.). The same requirement to account for information conditions the elaborate beginnings of Plato's *Parmenides* and *Phaedo*.

famished banquet (*loquax et famelicum convivium*), where instead of food he dined on nothing but stories (1.26, *cenatus solis fabulis*). On another occasion it is the waste of time and the disillusioned style of the series of inopportune fables brought on by his host which make him groan and become angry with himself for not having left his company earlier (2.15).

Not every story accordingly is pleasing to everybody, though the rule applied to storytelling in the *Metamorphoses* is clearly that stories are or at least ought to be entertaining. In the prologue of the *Vera historia* of Lucian, the justification offered by the author for his fabricated story is that just like athletes need to relax their bodies in between strenuous exercises, so philologists need to intersperse their serious studies with light reading that will relax their mind and prepare it for future labor. But although certainly light, Lucian adds that such reading should also contain some food for thought, something entertaining too for the Muses. In Macrobius' commentary on *Scipio's Dream*, which provides the only positive generic classification of the *Satyrice* that has come down to us from antiquity,⁴¹⁶ Petronius' literary creation is put side by side with Apuleius as a writer of entertaining erotic fiction. In the absence of other ancient classifications of the work, modern critics are required to take this one very seriously. Macrobius is trying to argue that Plato's (and by extension Cicero's) philosophical fictions are not just lies (as the Epicureans had said), but different and more noble than mere fiction as entertainment. He sets out a division between types of fiction to explain what is acceptable in a philosophical treatise:

There are two kinds of fables (the word indicates an admission of falsehood): the sort that aims only at pleasing the ears, and the sort that is invented also as an exhortation to virtue. In the class that affords pleasure to the listener we put comedies of the sort that Menander and his imitators produced on the stage, and stories of everyday life (*argumenta*) crammed with the fictitious fortunes of lovers, at which (Petronius) Arbi-

⁴¹⁶ The other generic classification of the *Satyrice* to survive from antiquity does not assign the work to any known genre. John the Lydian, in *Mag.* 1.41, lists Petronius after Turnus and Juvenal claiming that all three have violated the *σατυρικὸς νόμος*. Both the comparison with these two writers of Latin hexameter satire and the term used by John the Lydian are puzzling. The generic class *σατυρικὸς νόμος* cannot mean just 'satire', for then Juvenal's satires could not be said to violate the genre! After all, according to the modern understanding, Juvenal's work, perhaps more than any other writer's, can be said to define the genre of Roman satire. The Greek term *σατυρικὸς νόμος* must therefore refer to a Greco-Roman literary tradition considerably wider than what we are accustomed to call 'satire', and include Greek genres such as satyr plays. Even so, we cannot really answer the question how the *Satyrice* relates to John the Lydian's broadly defined genre.

ter exercised himself greatly and in which Apuleius, amazingly enough, occasionally indulged. This whole species of fables, which offers mere delights for the ears, a philosophical treatise expels from its sacred shrine and banishes to the nursery room. However, those stories which exhort the reader's intellect towards some form of virtue ...⁴¹⁷

Macrobius rejects the *Satyrical* and the *Metamorphoses* as mere aural titillation, because he is concerned with the genre of the philosophical treatise and its uncompromising search for truth and exhortation to virtue. This is a different standard altogether from Lucian's requirement that fictitious stories should not from urbanity and humor offer mere entertainment (μη μόνον ἐκ τοῦ ἀστείου τε καὶ χαρίεντος ψιλὴν παρέξει τὴν ψυχαγωγίαν), but also display some vision that is not uneducated (ἀλλὰ τινα καὶ θεωρίαν οὐκ ἄμουσον ἐπιδείξεται). It is easy to lose sight of this distinction between what is morally edifying (and defensible in a philosophical treatise) and what is regardless of that austere standard highly enlightening and educated. The presence of jest and lack of moral preaching does not of course preclude a masterful artistic vision, notwithstanding the concerns of sclerotic moralists.

If Macrobius rejects the moral or philosophical value of Petronius' and Apuleius' fictions, modern readers have long sought edifying, or at least truthful, statements in these works.⁴¹⁸ Let us do the same for the *Satyrical*. To establish the genre of the ancient "personal" novel, we must go beyond the form, and seek satiric or satyric content.

⁴¹⁷ Macrob. *Comm.* 1.2.7–8. *Fabulae, quarum nomen indicat falsi professionem, aut tantum conciliandae auribus voluptatis, aut adhortationis quoque in bonam frugem gratia repertae sunt. auditum mulcent vel comoediae, quales Menander eiusve imitatores agendas dederunt, vel argumenta fictis casibus amatorum referta, quibus vel multum se Arbiter exercuit vel Apuleium non numquam luisse miramur. hoc totum fabularum genus, quod solas aurium delicias profitetur, e sacrario suo in nutrium cunas sapientiae tractatus eliminat. ex his autem quae ad quandam virtutum speciem intellectum legentis hortantur ...*

⁴¹⁸ Traditionally there are three schools of thought regarding satire in the *Satyrical*. Scholars who tend to emphasize the earnestness of the moral satire include Highet 1941, Bacon 1958, Reith 1963, Arrowsmith 1966, and Zeitlin 1971 and 1971a. Scholars who stress the comic and non-moralistic nature of the work include Sullivan 1971 and Walsh 1974. The middle ground is taken by Sandy 1969 and Beck 1982, who like myself believe that the *Satyrical* is a comic satire which does not preach its message directly. For a survey of early reactions to Apuleius' levity or seriousness in the *Metamorphoses*, see Harrison 2002.

3.1.5 The Moral of the Genre

Unlike the rest of the *Satyrical*, the *Cena* is often supposed to illustrate a veritable scandal of the early empire, which was the excessive wealth of freedmen. That the depiction of Trimalchio's dinner-party is intended as a scandalous account is undoubtedly correct; however, as we have seen through the reconstruction, the same could be said of several other episodes which satirize such popular causes of complaint as the sorry state of rhetoric, the venality of the courts, the abuse of religious cults for financial and sexual exploitation, the abuse of the private *ergastula*, the abuse of the right to form guilds, husbands' complaints over their wives' supposed sexual attraction to strangers. It seems that the *Cena* was not so different from the rest of the work after all. A scandalous and sensational narrative is usually entertaining as such and the emphasis is obviously on making the most of that element of entertainment, rather than delivering an outright moralistic condemnation. Passing a judgment with moral authority is left up to the ideal audience, who are eminently capable of doing so, having been created as the implicit "normal" subjectivity which witnesses the narrator's comic act.

One is certainly struck by the limited apology offered by the narrator for the pathetic performance of his past self. Narrating his experience, he seems particularly conscientious when reporting the verbal abuse to which he was subjected by other characters. We recall, for example, his quarrel with Ascylos early on, from which he emerges an exposed hypocrite and branded as *homo stultissimus* (9.2-10.3). Far from trying to cover up the disgrace of this defeat by attempting to ennoble his intent, the narrator announces bluntly that the only reason why his young self so hastily sought divorce from his friendship with Ascylos was "lust" for Giton (10.7, *hanc tam praecipitem divisionem libido faciebat*). Another example of such deleterious testimony about himself comes a few pages later, when Encolpius reports that Quartilla mocked him as "a brilliant guy and a real source of homegrown wit" (24.2, *homo acutus et urbanitatis vernaculae fons*). Several times does he describe in detail his stupefied astonishment at Trimalchio's house.⁴¹⁹ Once he tells his audience that his friends laughed at him for panicking at the sight of a painted dog and the sign which said *cave canem* (29.1-2). An obviously clownish reaction to a common enough phenomenon, as any modern visitor to the archeological sites of southern Italy can testify (although we should keep in mind that Encolpius *qua* hero is an exile from Massalia and unfamiliar in the area). Later, when he must confront the real

⁴¹⁹Beck 1975, 277-278.

dog, he again exaggerates the extent of his terror at this infernal beast, by promptly reminding his audience that he had even been afraid of a painted dog. He likewise tells of how frightened he was by the “majestic” entrance of the stonemason Habinnas, a reaction which earned him again the title of *homo stultissimus* (65.5), this time from Agamemnon himself.

How should we explain the narrator’s self-deprecation and jokes at his own expense? What is it in the narrative situation which makes this clownish posturing expedient? It is conceivable that Encolpius has now improved his social standing, but this would hardly explain why he consistently humiliates himself in front of his audience. On the contrary, one would expect any social elevation to express itself in a more assertive tone of voice. It seems that we can only explain why Encolpius puts himself down if we keep in mind the considerable social inequality inherent in the narrative situation. The narrative persona of Encolpius, a (by now) Romanized Greek of poor origin, is very much inferior to his aristocratic Roman audience. It is usually the social superior who indulges himself in long-winded narratives about his own past to an inferior, and not the other way around. For narrative authority to work, there must be some such power at play, whatever the basis of the reader’s or audience’s respect for the author. In addressing himself to a distinguished audience, which by far outranks himself socially and morally, no matter how much he may have improved his lot subsequent to his adventures, Encolpius would have to adopt a humble and clownish *persona* in order not to offend or bore his discriminating listeners. The frequently outrageous nature of his story, and the ignoble past which it reveals, would make such comic posturing even more necessary.

There is, however, another side to his posturing. Throughout the *Cena* episode, for example, Encolpius tries to earn some points with his audience by implying that the reason why he made so many dumb mistakes was only his ignorance of such vulgarities as took place in that house. This supposedly noble *simplicitas*, coupled with his much emphasized disgust with the social monster Trimalchio, may best be explained as a rhetorical ploy to seduce his noble audience into believing that he and they, despite everything, share certain ethical principles. Implicit in this is also a reference to Encolpius’ Massaliotic origins. I do not want to exaggerate the narrator’s sophistication here. He is merely trying what any speaker would try under the circumstances, namely to secure the benevolence of his audience. What allows Encolpius to “get away with” his satire is his foreign provenance and self-deprecation, his careful definition of himself as a comic figure, partaking of the inadequacies of the characters in the narrative and thus no threat morally, any more than socially, to his presumed elite and cultured audience. We find

something similar in Horace's stance in the *Sermones*, where mixed with the sometimes biting social satire the narrator reminds his audience of his humble origins as a freedman's son. We should, however, resist the idea that this ambiguous posturing is distinctly "Roman", since the generic stance of satire, according to the Roman satirists themselves, originated with Greek comedy and a type of popular philosophical diatribe.

There are two obvious social concerns with which Encolpius attempts to color his narrative. First, the well known anxiety of Roman aristocrats about the moral implications of a widespread study of Greek rhetoric and literature. Secondly, the even greater anxiety and threat felt by these people in the face of moneyed individuals from the lower classes. These two concerns, which are prominent themes in the satires of Horace, Persius and Juvenal, are found in Attic comedy and a wide range of Greek literature as well. It would be overly modern to think that the critical distinction to be made here was merely that between "Roman" and "Greek" values. The study of national literatures is a late development in European humanism. Greek aristocrats were no less apprehensive about the democratic arts of public speaking and education for the common man than were their Roman counterparts. Neither is this aristocratic ideology unfamiliar to the Greek narrator, who evidently received his education in rhetoric and classical letters in his home city, Mas-salia. As a rule, however, Encolpius is notoriously elusive and un-committed to specific positive values. This attitude clearly derives from his marginal and socially ambiguous status as he communicates his report from the underworld across the unbridgeable gap between ancient social strata. He is speaking to an audience which is fundamentally different from himself, and his only means of retaining their interest and willingness to listen is to shape his discourse in conformity with their values and anxieties. This is his discursive strategy and the resulting narratorial stance comprises a major literary conceit in the *Satyrica*.

Although noble, his audience betrays signs of decadence and frustration. They are willing to believe that the world is going to pieces, precisely because it has lost the noble values perceived to be traditional in their own class. In an interesting passage Erich Auerbach attempts to tackle the complexities of the authorial stance in the *Satyrica*. It is worth quoting for the insight it contains into the social stratification which comes into play in this text:

Petronius ... looks from above at the world he depicts. His book is a product of the highest culture, and he expects his readers to have such a high level of social and literary culture that they will perceive, without

doubt or hesitation, every shade of social blundering and of vulgarity in language and taste. However coarse and grotesque the subject matter may be, its treatment reveals no trace of the crude humor of a popular farce. Scenes ... exhibit, it is true, the basest and commonest ideas, but they do so with such refined cross-purposes, with such an array of sociological and psychological presuppositions, as no popular audience could tolerate.⁴²⁰

The importance attached to the audience of the *Satyrica* by Auerbach is his genuine contribution to the understanding of the work. He sees the narrative as being addressed to a sophisticated audience, radically different from any of the lowly characters which appear in the story. Auerbach is not entirely successful in positioning the author with respect to the narrator and audience, but he is clearly sensitive to the problems involved (“Petronius” is significantly said to “look from above at the world he depicts”). Encolpius and the audience are not of the same social rank. It is the “sociological and psychological presuppositions” of the audience, rather than the narrator, which supply the premise of the social criticism in the *Satyrica* while the non-assertive and roundabout way of delivering it is caused by the narrator's inferior position towards them.

3.1.6 *Verkehrte Sprache*

As the extant text opens, the narrator is impersonating his youthful self, declaiming against declamation (1.1–2.9). What he says is that declaimers are possessed by an alien kind of madness (*alio genere furiarum declamatores inquietantur*) as they shout their declamations on exaggerated subject-matter in empty and noisy *sententiae* (*rerum timore et sententiarum vanissimo strepitu*). Students, moreover, are stultified by these exercises, since they hear and see none of the customs that are in general use (*nihil ex his quae in usu habemus aut audiunt aut vident*). As a result they are not only incapable of producing anything but *sermo vitiosus* (“faulty speech”, see discussion in section 1.2.7), they also feel as if they had been transported to another world when they visit the real courts of law in the forum (*cum in forum venerit, putent se in alium orbem terrarum delatos*). The distinction here made between hearing and seeing those things which are in general use and the virtual disease (*veluti pestilenti quodam sidere*) of certain contrived forms of

⁴²⁰ Auerbach 1953, 47.

speech is at the heart of the conservative “restraint” (*mens bona*) stylistics which Encolpius tries to emulate in addressing his audience.

These ideas, however, occur in a speech uttered in the name of young Encolpius, and the narrator seems to deliberately undercut his younger self when he adds at the end of the excited and inspired tirade: *non est passus Agamemnon me diutius declamare in porticu quam ipse in schola sudaverat*—“Agamemnon didn’t allow me to declaim any longer in the portico than he had himself sweated in the school” (3.1). Declamation is exactly what the young man had criticized most, and yet his older self refers to that very criticism as “declamation”. Moreover, when Agamemnon, in response to the criticism, extemporizes a satire in the style and meters of Lucilius, attempting to correct his own and others’ parasitic vices and failures as educators (5 vv. 1–22),⁴²¹ young Encolpius cannot resist the lure of the rhetor’s metrical verbosity (6.1, *dum hunc diligentius audio ... et dum in hoc dictorum aestu motus incedo*—“while I’m listening to him with close attention ... and while I was transported in excitement over this flood of words”). So much so that he fails to notice that Ascyrtos has run out on him (*non notavi mihi Ascyrti fugam*). Only later, during his quarrel with Ascyrtos (9.10–10.3), is he made to realize that the poetry of Agamemnon was nothing but “broken glass and dream interpretations” (*vitrea fracta et somniorum interpretamenta*), in the words of his young friend, and that his motives for listening to it were less than noble (*multo me turpior es tu hercule, qui ut foris cenares poetam laudasti*—“by Hercules! you are much less honorable than I am. You praise a poet to be invited to dinner”). He seems therefore in the past neither to have had the power to speak without falling into the vices of contemporary declamation and versification nor to have possessed any resistance to the deceptive attractions of these “perverted” arts.

Clearly the narrator is not presenting his younger self as any sort of credible reformer, whether in stylistic or moral matters. As for himself at the time of narrating, he is content with not letting his characters get away with boastful claims without proving them wrong immediately. Encolpius is making fun of himself in the past and he is far from excluding himself from the criticism that he has leveled against the scholastics. He is a speaker who is willing to give deleterious testimony about his own ineptitude, but he does this on one extremely important condition, the condition that this be viewed as symptomatic of universal decline. As he treats the *scholastici*, so does he treat every other type of people he meets in his story. They are all inept in

⁴²¹ Note that the whole poem is structured in the figure of *correctio* (i.e., *non x, sed y*), and switches from scazons to hexameters exactly at the *sed* which introduces the antithesis. For a general description of the figure, see e.g. Lausberg 1960, 386–7.

comparison with the audience, who afford the only example of apparent virtue and positive moral values in the *Satyrica*. In Aristotelian terms, Encolpius and all his characters are comic in the sense that they are *worse* than the audience. Their only redeeming factor is perhaps that they at times seem to know that they are comic figures.

When Encolpius and Ascyltos realize how shameful their quarrel is, they burst out laughing (*itaque ex turpissima lite in risum diffusi*), which is also the reaction of the *scholastici* when they come out from the extemporal declamation of the speaker who took over from Agamemnon (*iuvenes sententias rident ordinemque totius dictionis infamant*). In Trimalchio's house, laughter is also a spontaneous reaction to the way the host speaks and conducts himself, although it must be suppressed for reasons of flattery.⁴²² As Trimalchio is first carried into his dining room to background music and placed on fluffy pillows, the sight "squeezes a laugh from the imprudent" (32.1, *expressit imprudentibus risum*). After he gives a speech on the topic of bowel movements and the importance for health of unrestrained farting, even in the dining room, his guests politely thank him for his concern for them, while "hiding their laughter in the cups" (47.7, *castigamus crebris potiunculis risum*). Laughter in the *Satyrica* is thus often the only sign of moral rectitude in the characters of the story. It is a relieving and reassuring sign of sanity, in an otherwise mad world, and it can never be completely suppressed. During moments of laughter the characters and the audience unite, as it were, in their understanding of the moral implications of the story.⁴²³

⁴²² 52.7, *excipimus urbanitatem iocantis [sc. Trimalchionis], at ante omnes Agamemnon qui sciebat quibus meritis revocaretur ad cenam* ("We praised the urbanity of Trimalchio's joke, but none more than Agamemnon who knew how to earn another dinner invitation").

⁴²³ This repeated "background" laughter may be a generic feature of comic personal recollections. Since the protagonist is often the butt of the jokes, reports of spontaneous outbursts of laughter among the characters is clearly a good way for the narrator to signal to the audience when something is intended to be funny. Perry 1925, 40 n.3, lists instances of this same figure in the epitome of the Greek Ass-Story. Conte 1996, 73–74, argues in a somewhat similar manner for the role of the reader in revealing the intention of the "hidden author" of the *Satyrica*. The reader, he says, "assumes for himself the ironizing attitude of the author", until "[t]he reader's smile ... makes explicit the author's implicit voice, a voice that would otherwise be bound to silence in a text in which the narrator's "I" ostensibly conducts the entire narration". The difference is that whereas I read passages of laughter in the text as directive signs to the reader about the satire of the *Satyrica*, Conte uses the modern reader's laughter as such a directive sign, without allowing for the necessarily historical, cultural and individual nature of the reader's laughter. Plaza 2000, 163–164, argues that studying laughter and derision in the *Satyrica* is important for determining the genre of the *Cena*. Indeed, she claims that laughter and derision "are an essential feature of both satire and the farcical theatre, i.e. mime and comedy, the genres that compete for superiority in

Three of the freedmen express their fears that the *scholastici* are laughing at how they speak. Echion knows well that in their eyes his manners are ridiculous, and so he takes it upon himself to defend his point of view unprovoked. He pretends to sense a critical attitude in Agamemnon himself towards the way he speaks, and he imagines the rhetor as saying: “What is that boring man blabbering about?” (*Quid iste argutat molestus?*). He then quickly provides an answer to this hypothetical criticism: “Well, it’s because you, who know how to speak, don’t say anything. You are not like us, and so you laugh at poor men’s words, but we know that you’ve become silly from literature” (46.1, *Quia tu, qui potes loquere, non loquis. Non es nostrae fasciae, et ideo pauperorum uerba derides. Scimus te prae litteras fatuum esse*). Niceros, likewise, when asked by the host to tell a story, is afraid of the *scholastici*, who he thinks will laugh at his words (61.4, *timeo istos scholasticos ne me rideant*). As we have seen above, the narrator, to accentuate the shortcomings of such an incompetent story-teller, introduces his badly told ghost story in pompous epic language, *haec ubi dicta dedit ... exorsus est* (61.5). The same phrase is also used in Eumolpus’ exaggeratedly epic epic poem (121.1).

After the *pittacia*-jokes are read aloud to the guests, they all laugh for a while (56.10, *diu risimus*), though for different reasons. Ascylos, who has not mastered Agamemnon’s art of flattery, cannot hold back any longer and throws up his hands in a gesture of general dismissal and laughs until his tears start flowing (57.1, *ceterum Ascylos, intemperantis licentiae, cum omnia sublatis manibus eluderet et usque ad lacrimas rideret*). At this Hermeros is roused to his host’s defense, and tries to restore order by suppressing this unwanted laughter. He argues that Ascylos is alone in finding Trimalchio funny, and that Agamemnon, his senior as *scholasticus*, does not think the freedmen are ridiculous (57.8, *Tibi soli ridiculi uidemur, ecce magister tuus, homo maior natus: placemus illi*). He naturally does not delve into the reasons behind the rhetor’s acceptance of their manners. At this onslaught Giton, likewise, “indecently” lets out a long suppressed laugh (58.1, *post hoc dictum, Giton ... risum iam diu compressum etiam indecenter effudit*). At this Hermeros, who assumes Giton is a slave, turns his attentions towards him and prides himself for not knowing the nonsense of liberal education (*Non didici geometrias, critica et alogas naenias*). He furthermore insists that Giton’s master has wasted his money on the boy’s rhetorical edu-

this episode.” With regard to genre, Plaza clearly views the *Satyrica* as “synthetic”, and in other episodes of the work laughter suggests to her the genres of comedy and erotic poetry. See below section 3.2.4 on the origin of this approach to the problem of genre in the *Satyrica*.

cation (58.7–8, *Iam scies patrem tuum mercedes perdidisse, quamuis et rhetoricam scis*), for it is his classical education which has bred such arrogance in a common slave. Forming a contrast to Giton's useless education is Hermeros' own simple and practical instruction and the trade that he learned, the basis of his financial prosperity.⁴²⁴

In this manner the dinner party at Trimalchio's can be seen as one long match between declaimers who practice formal oratory as if they were possessed by alien furies—and who have therefore lost all sense of the reality of Roman institutions and life as it should be according to aristocratic values—and the freedmen who have not at all learnt to speak well, and for whom the only knowledge worth acquiring is their lowly trade. In practice, the freedmen may be said to win the match, despite being constantly subjected to ridicule, because the *scholastici* are not even allowed to open their mouths in their own defense, and because they are parasites at the freedmen's table. What their defense would have been, however, is no mystery because Agamemnon has ultimately blamed the madness of declamation on his students and their parents, by defining them as lunatics and claiming that learned teachers were simply forced to play along with their madness (3.2, *nil mirum in his exercitationibus doctores peccant, qui necesse habent cum insanientibus furere* [“No wonder teachers are at fault by employing these exercises, for they have to play at being insane to please the madmen”]). The parents of Agamemnon's pupils seem to be of the same social class and have the same values as Trimalchio and his guests.

From the standpoint of Encolpius' audience, the comic value of this encounter between two social types lies in the fact that the two groups have undertaken a mutual deception, which exposes both as deprived and hypocritical. While the *scholastici* attract their young students and earn invitations to dinner parties with honey balls of words all spiced up with poppy and sesame seeds (*mellitos verborum globulos et omnia dicta factaque quasi papavere et sesamo sparsa*), Trimalchio, in Encolpius' language, uses similarly spiced up dormice (*glires melle ac papavere sparsos*) to attract the *scholastici* to his dinner table. The *scholastici* trade compliments for food, whereas the freedmen trade food for compliments (35.1, *laudationem insecu-*

⁴²⁴ As is evidenced by the concluding part of Hermeros' speech, 58.14, “*Ego, quod me sic uides, propter artificium meum diis gratias ago*” (“I thank the gods for giving me the trade which made me what I am”); and the speech of Echion, 46.8, *artificium numquam moritur* (“a trade never dies”); cf. as well Trimalchio's words, 56.1, “*Quod autem, inquit, putamus secundum litteras difficillimum esse artificium? Ego puto medicum et nummularium*” (“‘What trade’, he said, ‘do we think most difficult after that of letters? I think doctor, or cashier’”).

tum est ferculum). The whole encounter is like that of two groups of human satyrs led by their Sileni, Agamemnon and Trimalchio. It is in contrast with a noble audience that is beyond criticism, in which both these groups are found inferior and ridiculous.

Versification is another type of discursive madness, to be contrasted with the “normal” manner of speech practiced by Encolpius in addressing himself to his fine audience. As we have seen, the *Satyrica*’s comic discrimination based on manner of speech is an essential feature of the work. Rhetoricians and poets alike are ridiculed for their inability to speak human language (read: the urbane Latin idiom of well-bred Romans). The underlying conceit is to recognize no other category of speech than the conversational language of the aristocratic audience, and measure all statements by that standard. On this criterion young Encolpius is saner than such linguistic madmen as Agamemnon and Eumolpus, but much inferior to the narrator who has acquired an idiom which is almost that of his audience. As we saw above (in section 1.2.6) the playfully pragmatic discourse analysis at work in the *Satyrica* was originally a part of Cynic literature. But primitivist attacks like this one on education and “science” must have had an appeal far beyond the ranks of Cynic “philosophers” in a society where the noble families and their emulators felt that their traditional monopoly on high culture was threatened.

No sooner is the narrator done with narrating the confrontation of the scholastics and the uneducated tradesmen than he introduces the poet Eumolpus. The poet begins by claiming not to be venal (like the *scholastici*) and adduces as proof of his artistic integrity the fact that rich men (read: rich upstarts like Trimalchio) do not like his poetry. But no one likes his poetry, except perhaps Bargates who speaks with *rabiosa barbaraque voce* (96.5) and needs the poet to compose invective against his mistress. Eumolpus is a compulsive versifier who with his extemporization in the pinacotheca on the capture of Troy provokes ordinary people walking in the temple portico to drive him away with a shower of stones as a cursed madman. He himself takes this response to his poetry as an inverse compliment, but young Encolpius fears to be taken for a poet as well (90.2, *timui ego ne me poetam vocaret*) while he is in the other’s company. Safely out of reach, the narrator reports that he asked the poet what he thought he was up to with this disease (90.3, *Quid tibi vis cum isto morbo?*). During the less than two hours that they had spent together, he says, Eumolpus had more often spoken like a poet than like a man (90.3, *minus quam duabus horis mecum moraris, et saepius poetice quam humane locutus es*). Even though the poet promises to abstain from this “food” for the whole day (90.6, *toto die me ab hoc cibo*

abstinebo), Encolpius leaves Eumolpus some moments later reciting again in the bathhouse (91.3, *relicto Eumolpo, nam in balneo carmen recitabat*). There he gets his usual hostile reception (92.6, *paene vapulavi, quia conatus sum circa solium sedentibus carmen recitare, et postquam de balneo tamquam de theatro eiectus sum ...* ["I was almost flogged, because I tried to recite a poem to those seated around the bath-tub, and after I was thrown out of the baths as I was thrown out of the theater"]).

Perhaps the most comic description of Eumolpus' peculiar madness comes at the end of the episode of the voyage (115.1–5), where the poet, in a moment of inspiration, is completely oblivious to the life-threatening storm and shipwreck they are suffering; a scene which could be read more generally as the "shipwreck" of poetry, adapting the classic "ship of poetry" topos to fit the context.⁴²⁵ Encolpius describes how the boys heard strange sounds coming from the captain's cabin, as if some beast were trying to break out of its cage (*quasi cupientis exire beluae gemitum*). They followed the noise and found Eumolpus in the midst of covering a great parchment with written verses. Amazed that he should have leisure to write poetry in such proximity with death, the boys dragged him out shouting and told him to restrain himself (*mirati ergo quod illi vacaret in vicinia mortis poema facere, extrahimus clamantem iubemusque bonam habere mentem*). The poet was merely angered and didn't want to be disturbed, begging to be allowed to finish his *sententia*, because, as he said, the poem was struggling towards its end ("*sinite me*" *inquit "sententiam explere; laborat carmen in fine"*). Eventually, Encolpius tells how he asked Giton for help and took the "frenetic" and "mumbling poet" by the hand and pulled him onshore (*inicio ego phrenetico manum ... et in terram trahere poetam mugientem*). The day after, Eumolpus with absolute consistency of character was again composing poetry, rolling his eyes seeking to pick up signals from afar (115.20, *oculos ad arcessendos sensus longius mittit*), this time for an epigram in memory of the drowned ship-owner Lichas.

On the way to Croton, Eumolpus takes the opportunity to recite his unfinished (*nondum recepit ultimam manum*) poem, which he introduces in a mock critical preface, to his fellow travelers, another captive audience. He starts by claiming that poetry is more than just versifying and using poetic diction, and then proceeds to distinguish himself from another equally undistinguished group, the declaimers, who he says are mistaken if they think that poetry is easier than composing controversies painted in vibrating little *sententiae* (118.2, *controversiam sententiolis vibrantibus pictam*). Poetry is

⁴²⁵ Connors 1994, 233.

different from prose history, or the oratory of the courts with testimonies from witnesses, in that it does not have to establish what really happened (118.6, *non enim res gestae versibus comprehendendae sunt, quod longe melius historici faciunt ... potius ... vaticinatio appareat quam religiosae orationis sub testibus fides*). Poetry requires a headlong plunge of the free spirit (*praecipitandus est liber spiritus*) into circumlocutions and divine agency with fabulously twisted expression of sententious opinions (*per ambages deorumque ministeria et fabulosum sententiarum tormentum*). The desired result will be like prophetic madness (*furentis animi vaticinatio*), although, according to the poet, the stuff of the civil war is crushingly heavy (*quisquis attigerit ... sub onere labetur*), and only for someone replete with letters (*plenus litteris*) to attempt. Laid down for imitation are such established institutions as Homer and the Greek lyric poets, but Virgil is included as well, and Horace, the only lyric Roman worth mentioning. The master poet must flee from all vulgarity of language and choose words removed from the uninitiated common man and he must adopt the famous opening words of Horace's third book of odes as his motto (*refugiendum est ab omni verborum, ut ita dicam, vilitate et sumendae voces a plebe semotae, ut fiat "odi profanum vulgus et arceo"* ["one must flee from every vileness, as it were, of vocabulary, and choose words remote from the plebs, taking as one's motto: 'I hate the uninitiated crowd and stay away from it'"]). Finally, the rhetorical *sententiae* should not be obvious and stand out from the body of the discourse, but should be woven into it and shine with the color of the poetic garment (*praeterea curandum est ne sententiae emineant extra corpus orationis expressae, sed intexto vestibus colore niteant*).

It is clear that this contradictory programme is not to be taken seriously. Its function is to be a further sketch of Eumolpus' poetic madness. The prologue is hortatory in tone and yet it is completely deprived of authority, coming from such a character. Like so many grand statements in the *Satyrica* this one falls flat on its face. The style of the rather long poem of Eumolpus, which follows, is an obvious, although not overly exaggerated, parody of epic conventions.⁴²⁶ This programmatic statement serves exactly the same function as the poem of Agamemnon (5.1), in that it comically makes the poet preach against vices which are his own in a language that is ridiculous and absurd. When the verbose and fantastic poem finally ends with the arri-

⁴²⁶ Eumolpus' verse and its postulated targets in the larger context of Roman literature is an immense topic which falls outside the scope of this study. We are only concerned with reading the poem in its immediate context and with respect to the *personae* of the narrator Encolpius and his character, the poet Eumolpus. For a recent study dedicated to the poetry of the *Satyrica*, see Connors 1998.

val in Croton (*cum haec Eumolpos ingenti volubilitate verborum effudisset, tandem Crotona intravimus* [“Once Eumolpus had poured out these verses in enormous verbal spin, we finally entered Croton”]), the poet’s equally verbose and fantastic confidence trick is described in language similar to his poetry (124.3, *ex praescripto ergo consilii communis exaggerata verborum volubilitate, unde aut qui essemus, haud dubie credentibus indicavimus* [“In accordance with the script we had agreed upon together in prefabricated verbal spin, we told these certainly gullible fellows where we came from, that is to say who we were”]).

3.1.7 *Infra pecuniam*

We now come to the second dominant moral theme in the *Satyrica*, namely how the supposedly non-aristocratic interest in moneymaking has replaced all other values with the value of currency. It is here that we shall find accumulative evidence for Encolpius’ consistent claim that the world suffers from an over-appreciation of the value of money. This theme especially allows for a reading of the *Satyrica* as a whole as an example of Saturnalian literature, a literature that aims at portraying a “verkehrte Welt”.⁴²⁷ On a purely syntactical level this tone of the work is manifested in the ubiquitous figure of *correctio* (“it was *not* what you would expect, *but* something entirely different” or “you should *not* flatter the rich as everybody does, *but* study hard and be virtuous”), which contributes to the sense of scandal and impracticable moralism of the characters. In addition to the widespread linguistic aberrations analyzed above, everything in the world of the *Satyrica* sooner or later finds itself “subservient to money”, *infra pecuniam* (84.3), as Eumolpus puts it.

Retracing our steps we recall that in the opening passages of the *Satyrica* Encolpius blamed Agamemnon and other teachers of rhetoric for having destroyed eloquence (*primi omnium eloquentiam perdidistis*) by teaching young boys contemporary declamation. Agamemnon’s answer is to defend his profession and explain what he ironically calls the secret art (*ars secreta*) of the rhetorical schools: As the hypocritical flatterer who seeks invitations to the dinner-parties of the wealthy, the teacher of eloquence (*eloquentiae magister*) must think first of all of that which is most pleasing to his students. Of course (*nimirum*), says Agamemnon, the teachers act incorrectly (*peccant*) when they make youths practice declamation ostensibly to im-

⁴²⁷ For the “verkehrte Welt” theme, especially in relation to the Cena and the Croton episode, see Döpp 1993 144–177.

prove their eloquence, but really to entertain them and attract them to the schools. But it is really the parents who are to blame (*parentes obiurgatione digni sunt*) who sacrifice their own children, like everything else, to self-interest (*spes quoque suas ambitioni donant*), and hurry them into the courts before their education is finished. Despite the fact that the parents themselves profess to believe that eloquence is a good and noble thing, it is still their *ambitio*, which we may translate in this context as “greed” or “corruption”, that gets the better of them.

This topic is further illustrated in a later episode (46), which we have previously looked at from another angle. At the dinner-party of Trimalchio, Echion the fireman (*centonarius*) addresses Agamemnon in a long speech, which reads as an illustration of Agamemnon’s explanation of the decline of rhetoric. The son of Echion, who is a promising student and has the right *ingenium* to become an eloquent lover of classical letters, will not be allowed to waste his time on such unprofitable and “polluting” pursuits. His father, who is a deliberately insensitive type (*non debemus delicati esse*), kills his goldfinches and disapproves of the boy’s painting (we recall that painting is another special interest of Encolpius alongside most forms of literature), because, according to the freedman, these things make the boy idle and unprepared for life’s real goal, moneymaking. Only law counts as a worthy subject in Echion’s mind, for it offers the promise of pecuniary profit.

The values expressed by Echion form a striking contrast, for example, with Horace’s account of *his* education in the sixth satire of Book I. The reader will recall that the poet’s freedman father, a man of exactly the same rank as Echion, despite his inferior social status, wouldn’t send his son to the local school, run by a nobody called Flavius, where, as Horace puts it, the sons of “mighty” centurions went. Instead he took young Horace to Rome where he would get the best contemporary education with the sons of knights and senators. We note the implicit acknowledgment of a two-tiered educational system. A good Roman education for boys was usually not to be had outside the capital.⁴²⁸ The thought of Echion’s Primigenius as another potential Horace, destroyed by his ignorant father, may be distressing to some, but Echion has a different view of things. What he sees are the local scholastics, including Agamemnon, who have been reduced to the role of parasites, and he doesn’t see this as a desirable future for his son.

Any knowledge of or even interest in the aristocratic schools of Rome is completely beyond this simple man. In the world portrayed by Encolpius, the

⁴²⁸ Except when private tutors were used in upper-class households. Why else does Quintilian make such a lengthy pitch for sending youths to school (*Inst. Or.* 1.2.9–31)? On the education of Roman boys in general, see Bonner 1977 and Kaster 1988.

final analysis must be that neither Echion's cruel pragmatism, nor Agamemnon's erratic educational programme, can offer the slightest hope to young Primigenius. He is simply a member of the lower classes, and as such will not receive a good education, no matter how talented. The same moral can be read from Encolpius' account of the children of Philomela, the matron of Croton, who prostitutes them to further her own legacy-hunting, while professing to leave them in the care of Eumolpus for the sake of their education (140). In Encolpius' report from the underworld, there is not a glimmer of hope for such children. Those who are not born to wealth are utterly ridiculous in their inferiority and their pathetic striving.

Another incident illustrates how money corrupts justice (12–15). Encolpius and Ascyltos go to the market in the twilight to try to sell the stolen *pallium*. Through Fortune's wondrous play (*o lusum Fortunae mirabilem!*), the prospective buyers of their stolen cloak are also the possessors of a small tunic, *tunicula*, full of gold coins, which the duo had stolen earlier and then lost. Young Encolpius, true to his training in declamation, is ready to argue the case formally on the elementary statute that a person refusing to return the belonging of another can be forced to do so with the injunction of a law court (*negavi circuitu agendum, sed plane iure civili dimicandum ut si nollet alienam rem domino reddere, ad interdictum veniret*). But here the narrator Encolpius suddenly interrupts his narrative to introduce his own recognizably Cynic point of view (notwithstanding his attempt in line three to distance himself from the charge of preaching a Cynic dogma):

quid faciant leges, ubi sola pecunia regnat,
aut ubi paupertas vincere nulla potest?
ipsi qui Cynica traducunt tempora pera
non nunquam nummis vendere verba solent.
ergo iudicium nihil est nisi publica merces,
atque eques in causa qui sedet, empta probat. (*Sat.* 14.2)

What can laws accomplish, where money alone rules, where poverty cannot win a case? The self same men, who go through life with a Cynic's purse, are not unaccustomed to selling their testimony. Accordingly a lawsuit is nothing but a public auction, and the knight who sits in the jury delivers a verdict that has been bought.

These lines about the inefficacy of the law in a society where corruption is a matter of routine are a rare direct statement from Encolpius in another discourse type which marks them off from the rest of the narrative (see my dis-

cussion in section 1.1.1 about the groundless removal of these verses from where they belong in the text). This moral “message” is dressed up as poetry to deliberately undercut the seriousness of the socio-cultural critique. When Encolpius dons a versifier’s mask, as he does here, it is with the intention of drawing a little bit of the sting and immediacy of the explicit social criticism by transmuting it from the real and relevant world to an impotent and tritely poetic one—entertainment displacing or veiling social commentary. To understand the subversive effect of this sudden switch from conversational prose to poetic recital one should always keep in mind the aspect of performance. Poetic rhythm and diction, which Encolpius treats, according to the convention of prosimetry, as a speech aberration, is a specialized “number” from his bag of tricks; the audience never knows whom they’re going to be seeing or hearing next, so they surrender to the entertainer’s charm and inventiveness, allowing the social message, which is scattered throughout the narrative and hidden in the talk of clowns and social inferiors, to build up by indirection.

In the past of the story Encolpius was full of simplistic optimism, but in the present narrative situation his older self seems fully cognizant of the degenerate state of things, although he usually does not allow his “serious” face to obtrude in the prose narrative. The narrator’s self-deprecating strategies not only protect him from his audience, but also protect the audience from the force of the satire by subverting it. Indeed, he protects himself precisely by protecting his audience. The satire needn’t be taken seriously, because it’s not advanced in a serious way by people (the narrator and his troupe of *personae*) whom the audience has to take seriously. However, the building up of the message and the consistency of the narrator’s ideas about the power and rule of money is unfailing and gradually takes on the function of a reliable truth about the world of the *Satyrice*.

Through the otherwise transitory events narrated, the characters behave in perfect harmony with this general principle. In the market scene, both parties to the above quarrel at last want to settle with a simple exchange of goods, because both think that this will be most profitable. But the forces of law and order, “advocates and yet little more than thieves” (*advocati tamen iam paene nocturni*), who want to make a profit out of the cloak, insist that the disputed property be deposited with them, hoping that out of fear neither party will show up in the morning in front of the judge. Their argument is that the case is not a matter of simple dispute between two parties of the type common in textbook cases of rhetorical *controversia* (*neque enim res tantum quae viderentur in controversiam esse*), since each accuses the other of steal-

ing (*in utraque parte scilicet latrocinii suspicio haberetur*) and neither party even pretends to be innocent.

None of the characters truly appreciates declamatory exercises for the simple reason that they are useless in the world of the *Satyrica*, where quarrels are not resolved in highly formalized disputes but through cash payments. Trimalchio, the uneducated but wealthy host of the scholars, knows this only too well, but in order to lend credence to his posturing as a well-bred lover of literary studies, he asks Agamemnon to perform an exposition of the *controversia* he declaimed that day. Agamemnon starts with a standard cliché: “A poor and a rich man were enemies” (48, *pauper et dives inimici erant*). But he gets no further for the moment because the other interrupts with his clever remark: “What is a poor man?” for which he receives the obligatory praise from Agamemnon. The implication seems to be that Trimalchio, who once was a slave and not even in possession of his own body, is now so rich that he can afford to ignore the existence of poverty. The narrator then continues with the completely indifferent phrase, “and Agamemnon introduced some *controversia* or other” (*nescio quam controversiam exposuit*), not even bothering to report the argument of Agamemnon’s *controversia*. After the exposition of the case, it takes Trimalchio two short sentences to clear up the problem definitively: “If this happened, then there’s nothing to argue about. If it didn’t happen, it is nothing” (*hoc ... si factum est, controversia non est; si factum non est, nihil est*). If we inquire into why, according to Trimalchio, a real case between a poor man and a rich man is not a controversy, the obvious answer is that since the rich man is able to bribe the jury, he will win in any case, and so there is nothing to argue about! However, if it is an imaginary case, it’s meaningless nonsense that no one but a declaimer would entertain. So much for the interest of Trimalchio in the scholastic subtleties of *controversiae*.⁴²⁹

The same topic also comes into play when the narrator introduces Eumolpus, the poet, into the *pinacotheca* and thus into his story: “Behold! ... an old man grown white entered the gallery, a person with a tortured face who seemed to promise something or other great, but not accordingly well-

⁴²⁹ Ever since Heinsius various commentators and translators have interpreted the words of Trimalchio: “*hoc, si factum est, controversia non est*”, as meaning that since a rhetorical *controversia* may be defined as a fictitious case, therefore a real event cannot be a *controversia*. This implies both knowledge and genuine interest on the part of Trimalchio in the formal terminology of the rhetorical schools. But such learned scholasticism in Trimalchio seems wholly out of character. Besides, if Trimalchio thinks that *controversiae* must be fictional cases, what does he then mean when he adds, “*si factum non est, nihil est*”? Surely, if Heinsius was right, he should have added, “*si factum non est, controversia est*”.

groomed or smartly dressed, so that he evidently belonged to that brand of *litterati* which is despised by the rich” (*ut facile appareret eum hac nota litteratorum esse quos odisse divites solent*). As if this were not enough Eumolpus introduces himself with these words: “I’m a poet and as I hope not of the humblest spirit, if laurels, which favoritism indeed also awards to the unworthy, are to be relied upon. You ask, then, why I’m so badly dressed. Well, it’s because commitment to genius never made anyone rich” (*amor ingenii neminem unquam divitem fecit*). Then he delivers six hexameters about how merchants, soldiers, flatterers and adulterers all profit from their activity when eloquence alone shivers in frosty rags and calls with “a penniless tongue”, *inops lingua* (83), upon the forsaken arts. He then switches back to prose to elaborate further:

“Non dubie ita est: si quis vitiorum omnium inimicus rectum iter vitae coepit insistere, primum propter morum differentiam odium habet; quis enim potest probare diversa? deinde qui solas extruere divitias curant, nihil volunt inter homines melius credi quam quod ipsi tenent. insectantur itaque, quacumque ratione possunt, litterarum amatores, ut videantur illi quoque infra pecuniam positi.” (*Sat.* 84.2–3)

“There is no doubt that this is the way it is. If a man sets himself against every vice and starts off on the straight and narrow, he’s immediately hated because of his different ways. No one can approve of conduct different from his own. And secondly, those who are interested in piling up money don’t want anything else in life regarded as better than what they hold themselves. So lovers of literature are persecuted by every means possible so that they too will seem subservient to money.”

It might for a moment seem from these words that a virtuous individual was speaking, but this is certainly not the case with Eumolpus. The man who like a Cynic philosopher calls poverty the sister of *bona mens* turns out to be an expert confidence man, who is willing to cook up the most elaborate deceptions for a profit. Like so many characters in the *Satyrica* he professes to know what is right, but claims that he cannot practice his virtues because of rich men and their corrupt ways. Despite his boastful claims of Cynic virtue, he too is “subservient to money”, *infra pecuniam positus* (84.2).

Encolpius tells his audience that while they were still standing in the pinacotheca he asked the poet about the reason behind the slothful state of contemporary arts and especially painting. This discourse is reminiscent of the one initiated by Encolpius when he met Agamemnon. The state of con-

temporary literature and visual arts is a constant preoccupation of his. Eumolpus' answer is prompt: "the greed for money has caused this upheaval, for in the olden times, when naked virtue still had its appeal, the liberal arts were strong and there was a mighty competition among men not to let anything of benefit to the ages lie hidden for long" (88, *pecuniae ... cupiditas haec tropica instituit. priscis enim temporibus, cum adhuc nuda virtus placeret, vigeant artes ingenuae summumque certamen inter homines erat, ne quid profuturum saeculis diu lateret*).⁴³⁰

Religion has gone the way of the arts. Eumolpus in the above speech in the *pinacotheca* laments that people have stopped praying in temples for such things as eloquence and philosophical wisdom. And they don't even pray for such obvious blessings as "good sense", *mens bona*, and good health. Instead, they have hardly reached the Capitol when they start promising gifts to the god for arranging the death of a rich relative, for letting them find a treasure, or granting them a certain level of wealth free of risk. Even the senate, says Eumolpus, which should be a model of what is good and right, regularly promises quantities of gold to the supreme god of the state cult, Capitoline Jove. Thus even this most respectable gathering of Roman citizens legitimates the greed of every one by assuming that even the father of the gods is "subservient to money", *infra pecuniam positus* (84.2). It is no wonder, then, that the appreciation of artistic beauty has decreased when to gods and men a mass of gold seems prettier than the works of Apelles and Phidias—those "crazy little Greeks" (*Graeculi delirantes*), he adds as if to draw a bit of the sting of his criticism of the Roman senate.

The edge of this criticism is, of course, blunted by the absurdity of the speaker, a crazy poet—as it must be. Encolpius cannot afford to preach senatorial corruption unfiltered to his Roman elite audience. The cleverness of the technique is to let the narrator develop a number of blurred or limited perspectives through his character *personae* and his own central narrator's *persona* on the same social problem. Because none of these *personae* has the authority to address the elite audience as a social and moral equal, their different voices cannot give offense. Collectively, though, their indictment is both accurate and damning. Again, if we consider the performance aspect,

⁴³⁰ Walsh 1970, 96f., tells his reader that Eumolpus is dead wrong about the *prisca tempora*. From a strictly historical point of view this may be correct, but the narrator believes it and his Roman audience seems to believe it as well. We cannot therefore use this supposed historical inaccuracy of Encolpius' satire as an argument to trivialize its message. Just because we are skeptical of the glory of the olden days doesn't mean that Encolpius (or Petronius, if you will) didn't believe in it. Let us remember that ancient satire and the modern discipline of scientific history are worlds apart.

the stance is very effective. Instead of causing anxiety and paranoia among the ruling elite, as did, according to Tacitus (*Dial.* 2.1), Curiatius Maternus' passionate impersonation, while reciting his historical tragedy, of the stoic "revolutionary" Cato, Encolpius can say worse things indirectly through his mask of a silly poet, so long as he does it in an entertaining fashion.

Likewise in the speech of the insignificant freedman Ganymedes (44), we notice the same preoccupation with the corruption of religion by money. Ganymedes is concerned about the misery caused by corruption in his hometown, the *urbs Graeca*. There is no bread to be had, he complains, because the aedile of the market makes dirty deals with the bakers to fix the market price. This wasn't so, he says, when he first came there from Asia as a boy. Then the magistrates were lions and punished those who imported bad corn from Sicily. Now, however, the aedile is keener to make a buck for himself than to preserve the lives of the townspeople. But then, unexpectedly perhaps, he takes a leap of faith and conjectures that all the misery must be caused by angry gods. His fatalism, of course, undercuts the political message without, however, retracting what has been said. No one, says Ganymedes, regards heaven for what it is, no one fasts and Jove is not worth a single hair to people, instead with eyes closed they all count their property (*Nemo enim caelum caelum putat, nemo ieiunium servat, nemo Iovem pili facit, sed omnes opertis oculis bona sua computant*). He goes on to describe a memorable picture of how the matrons of old in their best clothes used to climb the hill barefoot, hair loose and mind pure, and pray to Jove for rain. In those days, of course, it started raining by the bucket and they returned home "like drowned rats" (*udi tamquam mures*). This nostalgia for the good old times, before men grew obsessed with money, works to accentuate the sense of despair in the present.

The topic continues with obsessive persistency. Encolpius says that in Croton he sought a cure for his impotence from the witch doctor Oenothea. While she is away renewing the fire she had unwittingly put out, he fights a mock-epic battle with a flock of geese, commemorated in a virtual epic simile of at least five hexameter lines. He eventually kills their "leader and teacher of cruelty" (136, *dux et magister saevitiae*). When the priestess returns, she informs him through shrieks and curses that he has committed a hideous sacrilege by killing a goose that was sacred to Priapus. However, as soon as Encolpius offers to expiate for the crime by paying two gold pieces, with which they, as he puts it, "could buy both gods and geese" (137, *unde possitis et deos et anseres emere*), both Oenothea and her friend Proselenos are immediately calmed and become more than willing to cover up the sacri-

lege. And now, in a typical fashion, Encolpius delivers five elegiac distichs about the manifest omnipotence of money:

quisquis habet nummos, segura naviget aura
 fortunamque suo temperet arbitrio.
 uxorem ducat Danaen ipsumque licebit
 Acrisium iubeat credere quod Danaen.
 carmina componat, declamet, concrepet omnes,
 et peragat causas sitque Catone prior.
 iurisconsultus “parret, non parret” habeto
 atque esto quicquid Servius et Labeo.
 multa loquor: quod vis, nummis praesentibus opta,
 et veniet. clausum possidet arca Iovem. (*Sat.* 137.9)

Whoever has money can sail in safe wind and dilute his fortune in a private mixing bowl. Let him take Danaë to wife, and tell Acrisius himself to believe what he told Danaë. Let him write poetry, make speeches, command the world by snapping his fingers, win his court-cases and outdo Cato in moral authority. As a legal expert, let him have his “Proven” or “Not proven,” and be all that Servius and Antistius Labeo were. In short, whatever you want, with ready cash, make a wish and it will come true. Your moneybox has Jupiter shut up inside.

The pessimistic argument, “money is omnipotence”, is here considerably expanded to cover a vast sphere of influence. The rich man can sail in safe wind, and does not have to suffer shipwreck in life. He may dilute his fortune *suo arbitrio* (“at his own discretion”), i.e. he is the *arbiter bibendi* in life’s drinking party. He can weaken the effects of bad fortune, strengthen those of good fortune. Like Jupiter himself he shall have Danaë by showering her with gold, and her father will have to swallow his pride and accept whatever (mythological) pretext given. The rich man can freely compose poetry, too, whatever the extent of his talent; he can even declaim to the guaranteed applause of everyone present. These general statements about the power of money are interesting in themselves, but when compared with the narrated behavior of Trimalchio and his guests, for example, they take on a special importance for the overall design of the *verkehrte Welt* of the *Satyrical*. We recall Trimalchio’s distorted compositions (34; 41; 55) and his astrological *philologia* (39), all of which was met with applause bought from his educated audience. On the same principle, the rich man can also play every instrument, win cases in court and be considered morally superior to

Cato himself. Should he choose to practice law, money will guarantee the persuasiveness of his arguments no less than eloquence once guaranteed the success of Servius and Antistius Labeo. In short, everything the rich man wants is permitted him, because Jove is at his service, locked up in his moneybox.

There is an obvious similarity in the way the narrator introduces these lines here and the three elegiac distichs on corruption (14, *quid faciant leges, ubi sola pecunia regnat* ["What can laws accomplish where money alone rules"]). These poems—if that *is* the proper term—constitute the closest thing to a committed statement from the narrator that we shall ever find in the *Satyrica*. The change of discourse type, from the urbane colloquialism appropriate to addressing the distinguished audience to the more involved discourse type of elegy, is a clear indication that Encolpius does not want to voice such criticism without undercutting the message with poetic “madness”. The ubiquity of this message in the preserved fragments means that it must also have been an important aspect of many a lost episode. But this does not mean that the satire ever became overwhelming for the audience. It is precisely to avoid being taken too seriously that Encolpius lapses into verse. It is impossible, however, to argue that Encolpius’ obstinate criticism of ancient capitalism (money equals greatness) is meant to be merely funny, because the events of the story itself confirm in details the accuracy of the idea. At times the plot of the *Satyrica* is in such perfect agreement with Encolpius’ satirical theory of contemporary society that one could perhaps be justified in speaking of an illustration of theoretical principles.

Technology is next. Unsurprisingly, we detect the same pattern once more. The reader will recall the statement of Eumolpus (88) to the effect that in the “olden times” there was a great competition between men not to let anything of benefit to the ages lie hidden for long, but that among his contemporaries the greed for money had made an end of this unselfish scientific spirit. Trimalchio himself in an “urbane” outburst is made to illustrate the principle with an outrageous anecdote, the famous story of the man who invented unbreakable glass and was promptly rewarded by the princeps:

“Fuit tamen faber qui fecit phialam vitream, quae non frangebatur. Admissus ergo Caesarem est cum suo munere, deinde fecit reporrigere Caesarem et illam in pavimentum proiecit. Caesar non pote valdius quam expavit. At ille sustulit phialam de terra; collisa erat tanquam vasum aeneum; deinde martiolum de sinu protulit et phialam otio belle correxit. Hoc facto putabat se coleum Iovis tenere, utique postquam illi dixit: ‘Numquid alius scit hanc condituram vitreorum?’ vide modo. Postquam

negavit, iussit illum Caesar decollari: quia enim, si scitum esset, aurum pro luto haberemus.” (*Sat.* 51)

“Mind you, there was a craftsman once who created a glass bowl that didn’t break. So he got an audience with the Emperor and gave it to him as a present. Then he made Caesar hand it back to him and threw it on the floor. The emperor was visibly shaken. The fellow picked the bowl off the ground—it had been dented like a bronze dish—pulled out a hammer from the fold of his dress and proceeded to fix the bowl and make it as good as new. After this performance he thought he held Jove by the balls, especially after the emperor asked him: ‘Is there anyone else who knows this process for making glass?’—But see what happened!—When the man answered ‘No!’, the emperor had his head cut off, the reason being that if it was made public, gold would have become dirt cheap.”

This little story, whatever its origin, captured the imagination of ancient authors. Pliny (*Nat.* 36.195) includes it in his encyclopedic work, though, without giving it full credence. According to him a craftsman under Tiberius invented a method for making glass unbreakable. For this his workshop was destroyed in order that precious metals would not lose their commercial value. In Dio Cassius (57.21.5–7) roughly the same story is made to exemplify Caesar’s jealousy and the moral of the story is entirely different. There the inventor is an architect who had already accomplished the restoration of a collapsing portico in Rome, for which Tiberius rewarded him with money and exile. On another occasion when the architect was seeking pardon he deliberately dropped a crystal goblet and then repaired it, evidently to show off his skill at restoration yet again, but this time it cost him his life. Isidore (*Etym.* 16.16.6.) has the story in a version similar to that of Petronius and attaches the same moral to it, even asserting that it is true that if glass were unbreakable, it would be better than gold and silver. John of Salisbury (*Pol.* 4.5) relates the same story as that of Trimalchio in Petronius but adds much detail, although he preserves the moral of the story: Caesar has the artisan killed to prevent gold and silver from becoming cheap as dirt. With respect to our investigation, Caesar in Trimalchio’s story uses his power to kill an invention “of benefit to the ages”, in the words of Eumolpus (88). And he does this for exactly the same reason that the poet alleges as the cause of the demise of contemporary science, namely an obsessive concern with the acquisition and protection of wealth.

The last time the topic occurs in the extant *Satyrical* is at the very end where the motif of *captatio* or legacy hunting is treated. The comic evils of

captatio are a well-exercised theme in Greco-Roman satire. Horace (*S.* 2.5) treats this theme in a parodic dialogue, which is a reworking of a motif from the *Odyssey*, Book 11, and represents Tiresias advising Odysseus in the underworld on how to enrich himself upon arriving in Ithaca a poor man. The topic is not originally Roman, of course, since Horace is here borrowing a Greek comic *topos*, which exploits the convention of taking mythological trips to the underworld to seek information from the dead. The comic *νέκυια* was a favorite device of Menippus and other Cynics.

In the *Satyrical*, Croton is a city which has completely fallen to this nasty vice. Encolpius, Giton and Eumolpus have survived the shipwreck and just buried Lichas, the owner of the ship, when they take to the road again. From a distance they see a city and inquire from “a certain bailiff” about the nature of the place (116). The ancient glory of Croton is here deliberately emphasized in order to heighten the misery of its current state. Encolpius usually sketches the distant past in very positive terms to better highlight disgust with the present. The overseer, who has no other purpose in the narrative than to yield information to the vagabond characters, is not unsurprisingly concerned with the same cultural losses the narrator keeps lamenting. Literary studies are no longer celebrated in Croton, and neither is eloquence, and the virtues are in a state of neglect. No one raises a family either, for people with natural heirs are not likely to be courted by legacy hunters.

This absurd city stages yet another episode of the *Satyrical*’s protracted love affair between parasites and hosts. Eumolpus invents a confidence trick and poses as a shipwrecked man of great property, without heirs, of course, and in miserable health, in order to stimulate the generosity of the people of Croton. The spin which Encolpius puts on this traditional topic of satire is quite interesting. Letting Eumolpus & Co. outsmart the legacy-hunters by exploiting their greed to their own advantage, the narrator again pitches one group of madmen against another and so retains his audience’s good will by blunting the impact of the satire.

What seems to be only a simile in the city’s description by the *vilicus*—vultures eating corpses in a plague-ridden countryside—is later translated directly into action in the will of Eumolpus. The eating of his corpse is obviously proposed by Eumolpus as a deterring condition for those planning to collect his imaginary inheritance, but not even *this* arrests the appetite of the human vultures of Croton: “The enormous reputation of his money blinded the eyes and minds of those miserable people” (*excaecabat pecuniae ingens fama oculos animosque miserorum*). In the glorious hometown of Pythagoras, the famous vegetarian philosopher, the citizens are willing to become cannibals for financial profit, violating the most sacred taboo of civilization.

Eating human flesh is the proper behavior of Cyclopes, one-eyed monsters living beyond civilization and not bound by the laws of any city. As in the figurative language above, blinding is the punishment of cannibalistic Cyclopes. The episode of Croton, the uncivilized city—an oxymoron in Greco-Roman political thought—can thus be read as that of a troupe of satyrs (Encolpius, Giton and Corax), led by their Silenus (Eumolpus), who take up habitation in the caves of the Cyclopes (Crotoniates). In other words, a narrative obeying in some sense the laws of satyr-drama, the generic name of which was δρᾶμα σατυρικόν, or in the plural σατυρικά, and the preferred plots of which centered on the fabulous tales of the *Odyssey*.

The mention of cities and civilization brings us lastly to the fantastic poem on the civil war, recited by Eumolpus just before entering Croton. Here the same theme of greed destroying the City dominates the sensational description of the causes of the civil war between Caesar and Pompey (119). This unfinished impetus of a poem (*hic impetus ... nondum recepit ultimam manum*) of almost 300 hexameter lines is, as we have seen, introduced by its fictional author as composed in the spirit of canonical epic literature. But what is begun by involving the gods in a fabulously exaggerated version of Roman history characteristically ends with their flight and disgust with humanity. Thus the loftiness of traditional high poetry collapses into a description of the sordid facts of life.

The poem begins with a description of Rome at the height of her power and wealth. Victorious, the Roman by now possessed the whole world, and yet he was not satisfied (*Orbem iam totum victor Romanus habebat ... nec satiatus erat*). If there was still anywhere gold or sellable goods to be found, that land, that people was declared an enemy and war was waged for profit (3–18). This public greed leads to shameful immorality which is as hard for the poet to relate (119 v. 19, *heu, pudet effari perituraque prode fata* [“Alas! one is ashamed to declare and reveal future ruin”]) as it was hard for Encolpius to narrate the account of Trimalchio’s domestic madness (70.8, *pudet referre quae secuntur* [“One is ashamed to tell what follows”]):

- “Nec minor in campo furor est, emptique Quirites
 40 ad praedam strepitumque lucri suffragia vertunt.
 venalis populus, venalis curia patrum,
 est favor in pretio. senibus quoque libera virtus
 exciderat, sparsisque opibus conversa potestas
 ipsaque maiestas auro corrupta iacebat.
 45 pellitur a populo victus Cato; tristior ille est,
 qui vicit, fascesque pudet rapuisse Catoni.

namque—hoc dedecoris populo morumque ruina—
 non homo pulsus erat, sed in uno victa potestas
 Romanumque decus. quare tam perdita Roma
 50 ipsa sui merces erat et sine vindice praeda.
 Praeterea gemino deprensam gurgite plebem
 faenoris illuvies ususque exederat aeris.
 nulla est certa domus, nullum sine pignore corpus,
 sed veluti tabes tacitis concepta medullis
 55 intra membra furens curis latrantibus errat.
 arma placent miseris, detritaque commoda luxu
 vulneribus reparantur. inops audacia tuta est.
 hoc mersam caeno Romam somnoque iacentem
 quae poterant artes sana ratione movere,
 60 ni furor et bellum ferroque excita libido?” (*Sat.* 119)

“The same madness is in public life, the true-born Roman is bought, and changes his vote for plunder and the cry of gain. The people are corrupt, the senate of the fathers is corrupt, and their support hangs on a price. The freedom and virtue of the old men had decayed, their power was swayed by bribes, and even their dignity was stained by money and trodden in the dust. Cato is beaten and driven out by the mob; his conqueror is unhappier than he, and is ashamed to have torn the rods of office from Cato. Indeed it wasn’t just the man—and this was the disgrace of the people and the ruin of its ethics—who was driven out, rather in his person the power and glory of Rome were conquered. So Rome in her deep disgrace was herself price and prize, and she despoiled herself without any one to avenge her. Moreover, the greed of usury and the handling of money had caught the common people in a double whirlpool and destroyed them. Not a house is safe, not a man but is mortgaged; the madness spreads through their limbs, and trouble bays and hounds them down like some disease sown in the dumb marrow. In despair they turn to violence, and bloodshed restores the good things lost by excess. The poor are reckless for they have nothing to lose. While Rome was plunged in this filth, how could the healthy rationality of the arts have moved her from her slumber? No, to her only madness and war and lust aroused by the sword were exciting.”

According to Eumolpus’ argument, the depravity and loss of virtue in the senatorial class is to blame for the initial corruption which led to the civil war. In view of the character of Encolpius’ audience and the dominance of

the theme of money in the work as a whole, this passage seems of great importance for understanding the underlying moral presuppositions of the narrative. What is more, it seems on the face of it that we are to think of the civil war as finally putting an end to the arts and glory of antiquity and inaugurating the shameful contemporary state of affairs, a thoroughly unoriginal and corrupt Rome. If we add to this the glorifying description of the Younger Cato and the unfavorable treatment of the mad general Julius Caesar, we are forced to recognize here an example of the rallying cry of *libertas*, a nostalgic refrain in the rhetoric of the Roman senatorial class under the principate, sometimes called the Stoic opposition. The Younger Cato was an unmistakable symbol for these sympathies, especially under Nero. He was looked upon as the last defender of the Roman Republic and *libertas* (not, of course, a democracy but an oligarchy in the hands of the noble families).⁴³¹

Lucan gives an imposing portrait of Cato in the *Pharsalia* and for Seneca he is the ideal Roman Stoic. These may be deflated ideals to us, but in the early empire such ideas could easily be seen as politically flammable. However, by putting them in the mouth of the crazy poet Eumolpus, Encolpius can promote the message comically without committing himself to anything. These lines, surprisingly considering the nature of the audience, but unsurprisingly considering the *persona* adopted by the narrator, contain a criticism of the old Roman aristocracy. Eumolpus says that with the loss of virtue and the onset of venality among the *populus* and the *curia patrum*, i.e., the ruling upper classes (19–30), the *plebs* was defenseless against usury, mortgages and bondage from debt (31–5). Eumolpus has before blamed the *senatus* for not living up to its role as moral authority (88, *ipse senatus, recti bonique praeceptor*). And it seems that if these opinions of his—which the narrator has prudently assigned to a character other than his youthful self—are to be acceptable to Encolpius’ audience, they must be of unusual moral weight for Roman aristocrats.

3.1.8 Ideal vs. Real Audience

We can see from this that the implicit or ideal audience of the *Satyrica* is clearly not a real audience but an idealized construct of the narrator and his

⁴³¹ Cf. Sullivan 1985a, 117ff. But Sullivan who in general treats Petronius as a flatterer of Nero, and more so than for instance Seneca or Lucan, nowhere treats the political implications of this passage. My own impression is that the political views of the narrator of the *Satyrica* are not significantly different from what is expressed by other writers and intellectuals of the time.

text. It is important that we do not believe excessively in the historicity of Encolpius' good audience, who really play no more important role in the text than as intelligent and respectable foils to his comic act. The ideal audience is the locus of the *Satyrice*'s moral sanity and effectiveness as social and cultural satire, since the narrator, at least on the face of it, is just a clown and a fool. But the sanity of the audience does not derive from any actual performance before an unusually responsible, clear-sighted and truly cultured group of aristocrats. It's the narrator and his text that create the audience and its values, and they do so obliquely, by triangulation from several flawed perspectives. What the narrator has Agamemnon, Echion, Eumolpus, and his own younger self say and do about education postulates, when all put together, an audience capable of drawing sane and sophisticated moral conclusions about good and bad *paideia* and the state of letters and the arts. But the satire need not be taken seriously, because it is not advanced in a serious way by people whom the audience has to take seriously. Even when Eumolpus criticizes the corrupt senate, no offense will be taken, because the narrator has previously taken care to marginalize Eumolpus as a crazy poet.

It is not that the historical audience of the *Satyrice* was composed of people who were unusually tolerant of criticism or personally upright. The audience, like audiences for satire in all times and places (including, e.g., the Athenian *demos* listening to Aristophanes), are ordinary hypocritical human beings. They tolerate the satirist not because they are truly exempt from his criticism but because the effective satirist makes sure the "who-the-hell-does-he-think-he-is?" moment never arrives. There is also the matter of flattery—the real audience wishes to identify with the implied audience, which is beyond moral criticism. From the historical author's perspective, Petronius achieves this effect, (i) through an inferior narrator who "knows his place" and flatters his audience, (ii) through the limitations of the various *personae* through whom the narrator speaks, and (iii) through the limitations, triteness, even absurdity of the various discourses of those *personae*.

3.1.9 The Attributes of Encolpius the Prick

The *Satyrice* is a performance text, and this makes the act of telling the story even more obtrusive than it would otherwise be. In this respect it is very different, for example, from a modern novel, which is typically written for the silent and solitary reader. To give due respect to this performance aspect of the *Satyrice*, we need to place before our eyes, as it were, the figure of Encolpius as he relates his adventures to his audience. Although nothing

absolutely necessitates the geographical location in Rome of this implicit setting, the capital itself would be most in keeping with the nature of the audience. There is no need, however, to be too specific about this, since it could be argued that for such a generic audience a generic setting is all that is needed.

The importance of dress, gesticulation, and the use of the voice is great in any performative situation, and the Romans in general were no exception in assigning value to appearances. However, beyond the internal textual evidence of great liveliness in Encolpius' style of performance (see section 1.2.4), we know little about how the narrator is supposed to be dressed or groomed when he rides through his tale. On the other hand, information is abundant about such things as clothing and general appearance when we look at the young Encolpius traveling through Italy. It is, however, difficult to figure out how much of this description is still valid for the storyteller, some unspecified time after the adventures are over. We must necessarily proceed with caution here, and yet it is clear that the information provided by the narrator about his past self, beyond describing the protagonist directly, also functions as an indirect self-portrayal. His attributes are built up from several sources, both explicit and stated in his narrative, and implicit and based on well-known cultural and literary stereotypes.

To take an example, when Encolpius tells us of the practical joke played on him by the *anus urbana* (7.2), the implications are not likely to be lost on the audience. The old woman led him to a brothel which, she said, was where he "ought to" live (7.2, "*hic*" *inquit* "*debes habitare*"). If we gather the details of the appearance of this unhardened youth and his friends (102.12, *iuvenes adhuc laboris expertes*), we begin to grasp the full meaning of the old woman's mockery. As Encolpius tells us himself, he had long locks of hair falling over his ears (18.4), the loss of which caused him much grief (108.1, 110.4), a sorrow that was, however, easily cured by the aid of a curly blond wig (110.5). For clothes, he wore a short undergarment or tunic, the so-called *χιτών* (12.5, 19.5), and on his feet he had the unsoldierly Greek slippers, *phaecasiae* (82.3)⁴³²—Fortunata too wears golden *phaecasiae* (*Sat.* 67.5)—which quickly ruin his attempt to pass himself off as a member of the military. This general "softness" does not seem to have altogether disappeared in the necessarily somewhat older Encolpius who tells the story, as is

⁴³² φακίασῖα were white shoes traditionally worn by Athenian gymnasiarchs, as well as Attic and Alexandrian priests. Antony wore a pair as a part of a typically Greek costume, when he was in Alexandria acting as a private individual and frequenting the schools and temples of that learned city (App. *BC* 5.11).

indicated by the fact that the *Satyrica* is a love story about himself and the boy Giton.

Quite a lot may be deduced from the fact that he is a Massaliot, although he seems to have acquired some highly Roman attributes by the time he tells the story, attributes which he then unrealistically projects on to his younger self, especially his proficiency in the Latin language and knowledge about Roman literature. This Greco-Roman blending in Encolpius is, of course, made more complicated by the method of composition apparently used by Petronius, i.e. his transformation of a Greek text into a Roman one (see more on this below in section 3.2). Nevertheless, a constant of his identity, at least as a youth, is his origin in Massalia. Community stereotypes were as common in the ancient world as they are now (consider for example Homer's Phoenician pirates and Cretan liars), and some of Encolpius' attributes are features of his Massaliotic origin. The conservative and old fashioned Massaliotics, according to ancient sources, tied their hair in a knot, wore long and many-colored (women's) dresses, used perfumes and were accordingly considered soft and delicate, even effeminate. As we have seen in section 1.2.5 the Greek phrases "you might sail to Massalia" or "you are coming from Massalia" were proverbial expressions for someone who had fallen into luxurious and effeminate ways.⁴³³ The sources say that the women in this community were not allowed to drink anything stronger than water, the place being wanton enough without the women getting drunk on wine.⁴³⁴ Thus the *phaecasiae* (82.3) worn by Encolpius are not necessarily a sign of his wanting to prostitute himself, but may also be seen as the regular manner in which respectable Greek men dressed in Massalia. As we have seen above, his foreign style of dressing is open to two interpretations, it can be seen as archaic and respectable or luxurious and effeminate.

However, as Encolpius' narrative progresses, it becomes ever clearer that the wicked old woman was not alone in associating the young man with prostitution. The curious *foedus* of peace brokered by Eumolpus on the ship (109.2–3) is mostly taken up with the specification of the price to be paid by the adults for having sex with the boys (200 *denarii* for Encolpius, half that amount for Giton). Furthermore, the handmaiden of Circe, Chrysis, provides a detailed description of this aspect of our hero:

“quia nosti venerem tuam, superbiam captas vendisque amplexus, non commodas. quo enim spectant flexae pectine comae, quo facies medicamine attrita et oculorum quoque mollis petulantia, quo incessus

⁴³³ Suda, ε. 499, 3161; Ath. 12.25.

⁴³⁴ Ael. VH 2.38. The same custom was supposedly also observed in luxurious Miletus.

arte compositus et ne vestigia quidem pedum extra mensuram aberrantia, nisi quod formam prostituis ut vendas?” (*Sat.* 126.1–2)

“Because you know your sex appeal, you become arrogant, and sell your embraces, instead of granting them freely. What else is the point of your nicely combed hair, your face plastered with make-up, the soft glance in your eyes, and your walk arranged by art so that never a footstep strays from its place? It means, of course, that you are prostituting your beauty and selling it off.”

From this passage we learn for example that young Encolpius wore make-up. Should we think of the narrator, too, as wearing make-up? It is hard to say. One’s immediate assumption may be that if the narrator is considerably older he might no longer wear make-up. However, based on the above description wearing perfume and perhaps also make-up did not mean to Massaliots what it means to Chrysis.

Lichas’ “recognition” of Encolpius reveals another important attribute, for the captain identifies the bald and disguised Encolpius not by his face (and hands), but by his genitals, which he may be seen as addressing directly by the name of Encolpius since as he utters the greeting his hand and eyes are headed in that direction (105.9, *nec manus nec faciem meam consideravit, sed continuo ad inguina mea luminibus deflexis movit officiosam manum et “Salve” inquit “Encolpi”*). This recalls the earlier witticism of Eumolpus about Ascyltos: “his genitals hung down with such massive weight that you’d have thought the man himself was a mere appendage to his prick” (92.9, *habebat enim inguinum pondus tam grande ut ipsum hominem laciniam fascini crederes*). The appeal of the genitals is such that the man himself becomes but an extension of them.⁴³⁵ From this observation we can furthermore conclude that when Lichas addresses Encolpius’ genitals by his proper name, the implication is that the man Encolpius takes his name from his genitals. Encolpius’ phallic identity, of course, is most clearly evident in his *redende Name*. It is therefore not surprising to find that a large part of the

⁴³⁵ Quartilla is as interested in Giton’s immature genitals as she seems to have appreciated those of Encolpius, the two-legged donkey: 24.7, *mox manum etiam demisit in sinum et pertractato vasculo tam rudi “Haec” inquit “belle cras in promulside libidinis nostrae militabit; hodie enim post asellum diaria non sumo”* (“Then she slipped her hand inside the folds of his clothes, and fondled his very untried penis. ‘This will make a good starter to rouse our desire tomorrow, since I’ve already had the donkey today, I don’t want small rations’”). Eumolpus also carefully examines with both hands Encolpius’ resurrected member (140.13).

extant narrative consists of a long episode relating the dysfunction of Encolpius' *mentula*, a treatment of this subject which is unique in its frankness and scope in all of ancient literature.⁴³⁶

The phallic clown is a well-known archetypal figure in Greek culture. His earliest appearance may perhaps be noted in the Homeric underdogs, Thersites and Iros, and certainly in the parodic epic figure Margites and the philosophical clown and slave Aesop. Other marginal figures of literature include the satyrs and especially Silenus, whose looks were commonly made use of to describe the philosopher Socrates. Another philosopher, Diogenes the Cynic, may be counted in, and such comic characters as the *stupidus* of mime and the *scholasticus* of ancient jokes belong to the type. Beside the obvious attribute, the phallus, this figure was regularly identifiable by its shaven head or baldness, pointed ears, snub nose, and a pot-belly. Not all of these attributes need be present for the figure to be recognizable. Baldness is an especially prominent sign of the creature's phallic identity, often replacing the phallus itself. The reason for this is that baldness, besides apparently making the man himself look more phallic, was intimately associated with sexual activity in Greco-Roman culture.

According to Aristotle's *Historia Animalium* loss of hair from the head or eyebrows only occurs after a man has become sexually active (*HA* 518a). Moreover, no boy or woman or castrated man ever goes bald (*HA* 518a). Likewise, the hairs of the eyelashes are said to fall off when sexual activity begins, and the more the greater this activity is (*HA* 518b). Finally, in those who are given to sexual activity the congenital hair (the hair on the head, eyelids, and eyebrows) is more likely to fall off (*HA* 518a, ῥέουσι δὲ μᾶλλον αἱ τρίχες τοῖς ἀφροδισιαστικοῖς αἱ συγγενεῖς). Incidentally, Aristotle himself is the target of invective preserved in the *Greek Anthology*, which casts him as the lecherous bald man with the other defining characteristics of the phallic clown.⁴³⁷ Plato's description of Socrates' looks in the *Symposium* as resembling those of Silenus relies on the same easy association. The transferal of the attributes of Silenus (baldness, snubbed-nose and pot-belly) to Socrates became the basis of his portraits, and a cliché in later literature.⁴³⁸ In theatrical costumes, baldness could represent phallic looks with or without the accessory phallus, and was used to characterize parasites, slaves, cooks, (dirty) old men, moneylenders, and in general male characters with strong

⁴³⁶ The topic has been studied recently in detail by John M. McMahon 1998.

⁴³⁷ *Anth. Graec. Appendix, Epigr. irrisoria*, 11: Σμικρός, φαλακρός, τραυλός, ὁ Σταγειρίτης, / λαγνός, προγᾶστωρ, παλλακαῖς συνημμένος ("short, bald, stammering is the Stagiritic [Aristotle]; lecherous, pot-bellied, and the associate of whores").

⁴³⁸ Var. *Men.* 490, *tam glaber quam Socrates* ("as bald as Socrates")

corporal appetites over which they have little or no control. The pimp of New Comedy is bald and has a phallic name (e.g., Sannio, Ballio).⁴³⁹ These types, moreover, were the favorite subjects of vase painters and makers of terra-cotta figurines.⁴⁴⁰ In mime, the most common character was a bald clown called the “stupidus”, who was usually a cuckolded husband and would regularly be beaten during the act.⁴⁴¹

When the shaven and eyebrowless protagonist Encolpius is recognized by his prick by Lichas, he resembles a *cinaedus* (Gel. 6.12.5, and Cic. *Q. Rosc.* 20). This is perhaps a sign of what is coming, and Encolpius is certainly in some sense a *cinaedus* since he delivers his description of an attempt at self-castration in the Sotadean meter (132.8). But he also resembles the men with shaven heads, memorably described by Lucian (*Merc. Cond.* 1), who gather in crowds at the temples and spin yarns about their shipwreck and unlooked-for deliverance, which is exactly what the narrator Encolpius is doing as he gives us this account of his shameful “recognition” and subsequent unexpected salvation.

The association of baldness and a phallic nature was equally close in late republican and early imperial Rome, as is testified by a popular verse against Julius Caesar, *Urbani, servate uxores: moechum calvom adducimus* (“Men of the City, guard your women, we are bringing a bald adulterer”),⁴⁴² and another verse by Juvenal, *Cum ... / ... calvo serviret Roma Neroni* (“When ... Rome was slave under bald Nero”), which is given a sexual interpretation by Servius.⁴⁴³ Pliny reports, in language reminiscent of Aristotle’s *Historia Animalium*, that among the hairy tribes of the Alps and Gallia Comata loss of hair is rare in the case of a woman, unknown in eunuchs, and never occurs in any case before sexual intercourse has taken place.⁴⁴⁴ Seneca, the philosopher, believed that baldness and gout in women were recent, and a sign of the times. Born to be passive in sex (*pati natae*), women had violated the law of nature by somehow (Seneca does not elaborate this point) becoming actively engaged in sex through penetrating men (*viros ineunt*). As a fitting punishment, argues the philosopher, they now have lost the privileges of their sex and are beginning to suffer from virile diseases (*damnatae sunt morbis virilibus*).⁴⁴⁵

⁴³⁹ See, e.g., Plaut. *Rud.* 371, and Pollux 4.145, “receding hairline or bald”.

⁴⁴⁰ For illustrations, see Nicoll 1963, 43–89.

⁴⁴¹ Maxwell 1993, 10

⁴⁴² Suet. *Jul.* 51; cf. *SHA* 15.14.2, *calvus moechus* (“bald adulterer”).

⁴⁴³ Juv. 4.38, and Serv. *Aen.* 4.214.

⁴⁴⁴ Plin. *Nat.* 11.131.

⁴⁴⁵ Sen. *Ep.* 95.21; see Adams 1982, 190f.

If I am correct in assuming that Encolpius the narrator is a bald man in conformity with his age and type—a point which will necessarily remain speculative—a good parallel to him would be offered by Lucius, the narrator of the *Metamorphoses* of Apuleius. This luckless young nobleman turned phallic creature by magic lotions appropriately portrays himself at the end of his narrative as completely bald or shaven, and thus marks himself off as being still a phallic clown at the time of narrating his story, despite having regained his human form and lost the donkey-penis (the shaven head of Lucius the *pastophorus* is as ambiguous as Encolpius' white shoes; it is open to a respectable religious interpretation and a shameful phallic one). Significantly, in the shape of an ass, Lucius, like the “stupidus” of mime, is constantly being beaten. Jack Winkler speculated in this context that an openly phallic narrator could well be an indication of a certain lack of control over the material of the story. Such powerlessness would of course be a narrative stance and not indicate a lack of sophistication. Lack of narrative control can manifest itself in formal features such as mixture of discourses (an indication of inconsistency and lack of authority in the character), a method of composition that may go all the way back to the Homeric poem *Margites*.

This is so despite the fact that the phallus may also be thought of as the prime symbol of dominance and patriarchal authority. Although ithyphallic effigies were common at festivals, as well as in apotropaic trinkets and wall-carvings, those who actually exercised patriarchal authority seem to have rigorously concealed this organ or preferred to portray it as small and immature.⁴⁴⁶ Thus, Right in the *Clouds* of Aristophanes promises a small penis as one of the good results of an old-fashioned aristocratic education.⁴⁴⁷ As a dramatic device in Old Comedy, the depiction of men with huge artificial erections was designed to produce laughter. Mocking laughter seems likewise to be what met the bald man of antiquity on stage and off.⁴⁴⁸ These “deformities” were seen as a sure sign of a low and shameless nature, and therefore justified the instantaneous degradation of the individual in question. A male who is so obviously not in control of his appetites is seen as the very opposite of the free male citizen, who was required to adhere rigorously to the ideals of individual autonomy and restraint. Any sign of obsessive behavior or dependency can quickly become a liability when the basis of the

⁴⁴⁶ A notable exception from this rule is Caesar's veiled obscene threat to the senate after his military successes in Gallia that *proinde ex eo insultaturum omnium capitibus* (“from then on he would shame the heads of all [senators]”), reported by Suetonius (*Jul.* 22.2).

⁴⁴⁷ Dover 1978, 125–6; Henderson 1991, 109.

⁴⁴⁸ Plut. *Mor.* 86b–92f (88 E 10); Lucian *DMort.* 1.2; D.C. *Hist. Rom.* 76.8.4.; Schol. *Ar. Nu.* 145a; and Syn. *Calv. encom.* 7.

individual's citizen-rights derive from the assumption that he is a free and rational agent, and when the male citizen's mastery of his appetites is seen as a condition for his mastery of his social inferiors.⁴⁴⁹ We have therefore the paradox of the over-sized phallus which is nevertheless unmanly.

We may speculate that Encolpius the narrator of the *Satyricon* is bald without deriving this attribute from anything more specific than a stock figure of Greco-Roman culture. Just as Lucius, in the form of an ass, is constantly beaten and ridiculed, the luckless male prostitute Encolpius is sought after and used for the sexual gratification of other characters in the story, and is therefore the very opposite of a dominant male. Although these two narrators share such fundamental aspects, we need not rely on Ciaffi's thesis that Apuleius transferred some of Encolpius' traits to his Latin adaptation of the Greek Ass-Story.⁴⁵⁰

If Encolpius the narrator were bald, every reference to the hair that he was so proud of in the past would thus acquire special significance. Take for example the discomfort expressed in these words, "I continually kept hiding ... my face because I understood that I was marked by no ordinary ugliness" (110.4, *abscondebam ... frequentius vultum intellegebamque me non tralaticia deformitate esse insignitum*). We may compare this with Lucius' long and lofty eulogy about the importance of hair on the head of beautiful women (2.8–9). Coming from bald and phallic narrators such emphasis on the beauty of hair makes good sense as comic characterization, but would otherwise be rather pointless. It would also be a further sign of shamelessness for Encolpius to deliberately draw attention to this significant (lack of) attribute, and make fun of it.

A work called *Satyricon*,⁴⁵¹ which features the travelogue and erotic memoirs of a man called Encolpius, narrated in a mixture of discursive types to an audience of his betters, is very likely a continuation of the general comic tradition which begins with Margites and continues with satyr plays and the comic theater. If young Encolpius is a satyr, the narrator may be likened to a Silenus. They are both of related nature, but the older one has lost most of his youthful pretensions and posturing (along with his hair), and acquired a gift for telling stories. The distance between the implied nobility and virtue

⁴⁴⁹ As is argued by Halperin 1990, 88–112, and Edwards 1993, 63–97.

⁴⁵⁰ Ciaffi 1960.

⁴⁵¹ The adjective σατυρικός is used, for example, by Plutarch to describe the fun loving crowds of the theaters and palaestra, to which the emperor Nero had been so generous: "men who, like satyrs, live for each day"—ἐφήμεροι καὶ σατυρικοὶ τοῖς βίοις ἄνθρωποι (*Galba* 16); cf. the words of Eumolpus at *Sat.* 99.1.

of the audience and the shamelessness and low social status of the narrator assures the effectiveness of both the comedy and the satire.

3.2 The Hidden Genre

3.2.1 Origins

In this final chapter, I intend to submit new arguments regarding the origin and mode of composition underlying the *Satyrica* of Petronius. I have attempted earlier to show that the text under scrutiny is written expressly for performance by a single actor, or ancient *lector* in the sense of a lively reciter. It has also been shown, in the central chapters, that the original *Satyrica* was not as radically episodic as is often assumed, but rather exhibited a central plot constructed around the person of the narrator, and organized by a technique which on the whole resembles that used in other known Greek and Greco-Roman prose fictions. In the preceding chapter, moreover, we have attempted to define and describe the genre of the ancient “personal recollection” novel, and discussed the narrator Encolpius, his “philosophy”, attributes, and comically subordinate social and moral status vis-à-vis his audience. All these arguments have aimed at restoring to the *Satyrica* its original form as an extended fictional narrative with a unity and logic of its own, unrelated to the author’s biography. It is now time to place the work as described in the context of Greco-Roman literary history.

By scrutinizing the peculiar mixture of Greek and Roman linguistic and cultural elements in the text, I argue that the realism of the *Satyrica* is illusory, because its blend of Greek and Latin cultures was nowhere and never exemplified in the real world. To account for the hybrid nature of the work, I advance a new hypothesis regarding the composition of the *Satyrica*, which can resolve various difficult problems in the traditional scholarship without diminishing the value of much excellent work in the field. According to our hypothesis Petronius was not merely working in the tradition of the Greco-Roman comic novel when he wrote the *Satyrica*, but was freely adapting a specific Greek text, now lost, which was likewise written in a mixture of discourse types. Because of the many Roman elements in the *Satyrica*, studies of its intertextual relationship with other Roman works are important, even if the work as a whole has a Greek model. Petronius can, now as before, be seen to draw on other genres, both Greek and Latin, for various other effects, techniques, themes, and subjects, though the emphasis should

naturally be on the main generic features of the narrative.⁴⁵² In my view the genre of the *Satyrice* is neither an original invention nor a synthetic amalgam of various other genres without a unity and character of its own, but a definable and known ancient genre with distinct features.

The direction of my argument calls for an exploration of the possible antecedents of the Greek work behind the *Satyrice*, preserved as little more than titles, although sometimes helpfully described in ancient testimony. Later texts belonging to the same genre will also be taken into account, including the lost Greek model of the *Metamorphoses* of Apuleius and recently discovered Greek papyri containing fragments of prosimetric and non-prosimetric erotic and criminal fictions. This evidence should make it possible, in conjunction with our explication of the narrative structure of the *Satyrice*, to provide a rough description of the literary form of the *Satyrice*, a form that in antiquity even had a name of its own.

3.2.2 The Analytic Rigor of Nationalism

The greatest obstacle to revising our understanding of how the writer of the *Satyrice* went about composing his work is not so much the lack of ancient sources as the peculiar place occupied by Petronius Arbiter in modern narratives of Roman literary history. In the last decades of the nineteenth century, Petronian scholarship—under pressure from pervasive ideologies, relating to the consolidation of national states in Europe, and the general upheaval caused by the revolutionary progress in science and technology—began to invest unstintingly in a vision of Petronius as a national writer and a great innovator. According to this new interpretation, Petronius had, in the fashion of contemporary writers of Naturalist documentary novels such as Emile Zola, invented a new form of literature for describing the daily life and manners of his ancient Italian fellow countrymen. This conception of Petronius as the ancient Roman master of a modern literary genre coincided with the tendency of politically active German philologists to see in the unification of ancient Italy under Roman rule a classical model for their own project of building a modern national state.

⁴⁵² Petronius can be seen, with Sandy 1974b, as drawing on contemporary farce as continuing metaphor, and, with Panayotakis 1995, as drawing on the same genre to facilitate the imaginative representation or “staging” of certain episodes of the narrative; likewise he can be seen, with Bücheler 1862, as drawing on Varronian satire for the application of prosimetry in Latin, and, with Beck 1982, as drawing on Lucilian satire in the adaptation of the narrative persona.

Although a modified version of this romantic idea of our author has until recently held a great deal of currency in the scholarship, it cannot be taken for granted that today's students of the *Satyrical* are generally familiar with the books and articles where this interpretation was first presented with the backing of learned scholarly argumentation. To name a distinguished example, Winkler and Stephens, in a commentary on the *Iolaos* fragment, claim that the problem of composition in Petronian scholarship has been influenced by the "prejudice of Hellenists that Petronius 'must have had' a Greek antecedent."⁴⁵³ It is not difficult to demonstrate that the truth is exactly the opposite, for a strong bias has existed for well over a century towards viewing Petronius as the quintessential Roman or ancient Italian author, whose artistic "originality", supposedly, was not compromised by "foreign" Greek influence. Because of this forgetfulness about the origins of the ruling trend of Petronian scholarship in the twentieth century, even among the best of scholars, it will be necessary to survey in some detail the often hot-headed but mostly brilliant writings of the early modern Petronians who, in the last decades of the nineteenth century, defined the problems and invented the solutions on which subsequent criticism relies.

The modern reception begins with Franz Bücheler's edition of the text in 1862, which still defines the practices of current editors. In this first modern edition the *Satyrical* is known as the *Saturae* or Satires of Petronius, and published in a single volume with the prosimetric satires of Varro and Seneca, along with Priapic poetry. This edition put our text squarely in the class of Roman satire. Because of the acceptance of Isaac Casaubon's classic treatise, *De Satyrical Graecorum Poesi & Romanorum Satira* (Paris 1605), which argued for the necessity of a radical differentiation between Roman satire and Greek satyric poetry, this meant that any attempt to relate the *Saturae* of Petronius to Greek texts could provoke suspicion of category confusion. Bücheler nevertheless identifies the narrative structure and setting as Greek and correctly emphasizes the centrality of the narrative *persona* of the Greek narrator, "Encolprios" (note the Greek -os ending). In a section of his introduction devoted to composition and over-all structure, Bücheler first acknowledges the difficulties involved because of the state of the text, and then summarizes what appear to be the approximate facts about the narrative form, the plot, and the time in which the story is set:

Petronius seems to have woven his satires in such a way ... that all words and action in Greek style referred back to the single person of En-

⁴⁵³ Stephens and Winkler 1995, 364.

colpios narrating the fateful events of his life. Hence he says on p. 77 (line 16): “the mere recollection of which, take this speaker’s word for it, disgusts me”; and on p. 83 (line 18): “I’m ashamed to tell what follows.” Then he divides the events between various cities that Encolpios visits on his travels. Indeed, the extant books take place in Campania and among the Crotoniates, but another and earlier part of the *Satires* happened among the Massaliots, as I gather from fragments III and I. It seems probable that the writer made his fiction about this journey undertaken by Encolpios fall in the last years of the reign of Tiberius.⁴⁵⁴

Nevertheless Bücheler assumes, as have done other scholars after him, that Petronius wholly invented the plot of the wandering Greek Massaliot. The influences he allows from Greek sources are restricted to New Comedy and philosophical character sketches. Of Roman works, however, he considers Varro’s *Satirae Menippeae* as the model, and he finds Horatian influence likely as well. In Bücheler’s presentation of the work, there is nevertheless still no sign of the anomaly or paradox that was later to become our author’s hallmark.

Another significant event in the reception of Petronius took place in 1876, when a clever young philologist, Erwin Rohde, published a complete study on the origin of the Greek Romance, *Der griechische Roman und seine Vorläufer*, which rejected any generic relation between the *Satires* of Petronius and the extant Greek romances.⁴⁵⁵ It is well known that Rohde had little appreciation of the Greek Novel, which he saw as being a ‘synthetic’ type of literature: sentimental, because of its origin in erotic poetry; fabulous, because of its origin in fantastic travel literature, or *Reisefabulistik*; and stylistically pretentious, because it was written in the Second Sophistic. Although falling outside of his topic, Rohde dedicated one of his extended philological footnotes to the *Satires* of Petronius, which he refers to simultaneously as a “picaresque novel” and a “Menippean satire”.⁴⁵⁶ Following

⁴⁵⁴ ita ... contexuisse Petronius satiras videtur ut dicta factaque omnia Graeco more ad unam referret personam Encolpii sua fata enarrantis. hinc ille p.77, 16 etiam recordatio me inquit si qua est dicenti fides, offendit et p. 83, 18 pudet referre quae secuntur. deinde res gestas disposuit per varias urbes quas peregrinando Encolpios obierat. et libri quidem quae servarunt, in Campania aguntur et apud Crotoniatas, aliam autem et priorem partem satirarum apud Massilienses actam esse colligo ex fr. III et I. ceterum incidisse suscepta ab Encolpio itinera scriptor nescio an finxerit in ultimos annos quibus regnabat Tiberius.

⁴⁵⁵ Rohde 1876, 248–50.

⁴⁵⁶ The definition of the *Satyrical* as picaresque novel, or *Schelmenroman*, was later reiterated by von Wilamowitz-Möllendorff 1905, 190, and is still the basic term used by Müller and Ehlers, although it has drifted from *Schelmengeschichten* (1965) to *Schelmenszenen* (1983),

Bücheler, Rohde derives the work from a mostly lost type of ancient literature which he describes as “a humorous genre of popular-philosophical writing” (*witzige Gattung popular-philosophischer Schriftstellerei*), a specifically κωνικὸς τρόπος in a mixture of prose and poetry, which is evidenced to a certain extent by ancient character sketches (e.g. Theophrastus), but more importantly by the writings of the Cynics Bion, Menippus, Krates, Monimus and Meleager. This genre, according to Rohde, was first adapted into Latin by Varro, and later imitated by Seneca the Younger. In laying out the development of Menippean satire, Rohde acknowledges a debt to his friend the young classicist Friedrich Nietzsche, who had argued a few years earlier, on the evidence of Probus (*ad Verg. Ecl.* 4.31), that Varro followed Menippus closely both with regard to the form and spirit of his satires.⁴⁵⁷ Petronius is following Varro, Rohde concludes, as did Seneca, his contemporary. Accordingly, if there was any Greek background material to the *Satyrica*, it had already been filtered through Varro and turned into Roman satire before it could exert influence on Petronius.

This anxiety about influence is everywhere present in the classical scholarship of the period, but finds its most pronounced expression in an article published in *Hermes* two years later, 1878, by Theodor Mommsen, a Berlin professor towering over generations of German philologists. The article sets out to accomplish the apparently straightforward task of locating the Campanian city of Trimalchio and analyzing the epigraphic style of the freedman’s projected epitaph, for the purpose of dating the work. However, the impact it had on scholarship derived from a side issue, addressed by the historian with such enthusiasm and appealing to so many contemporary passions as to spark a revolution in the study of the *Satyrica*.⁴⁵⁸

After praising the account of the adventures of Encolpius and his comrades as being in the first rank in Roman literature for “originality” and “skillful mastery”, Mommsen acknowledges—obliged to do so by Bücheler’s description of the work—that the author of the *Satyrica* has an obvious fondness for setting the scenes of his story in Hellenic environments, first in Massalia, and then in Greek Campania and Croton. However, despite this fact, Mommsen claims that it is clear that Petronius “has, like hardly any other, given full expression to the distinct Italic identity” (*wie kaum ein anderer die italische Individualität zum vollen Ausdruck gebracht hat*), and,

in accordance with the increasing fragmentation of the work at the hand of scholars.

⁴⁵⁷ Nietzsche 1870, §11 *ad fin.*; in Colli and Montinari 1982, 2:1, 240f.

⁴⁵⁸ Mommsen 1878, 106–121. This article was later identified by Bürger 1892, 346 n.2, as the origin of the unprecedented view that the work of Petronius was “vielleicht das künstlerisch höchststehende Erzeugniss der ganzen römischen Litteratur.”

“perhaps alone of all the Romans, has followed the route of his own genius, independent of Greek models” (*vielleicht allein unter allen römischen unabhängig von griechischen Mustern seinen eigenen genialen Weg gegangen ist*).

Having formulated this paradox, Mommsen must now offer an explanation of how Petronius could give “full expression” to his “Italic identity” in a work of literature about Greek characters moving in a Greek environment. On the one hand, he argues, Petronius had to be careful not to give any hint of “the firm footing of his own nationality” (*den festen Boden der eigenen Nationalität*) in order not to spoil “his setting in an essentially Hellenic environment” (*seine Szene in das eigentlich hellenische Gebiet*), but on the other—and to the same effect—he had no mind to dispense with “the influence of the Greek essence” (*die Einwirkungen des griechischen Wesens*) in the representation of “his home country” (*seiner Heimath*) and his times. Mommsen’s Petronius, who is an “artist” (*Künstler*), and a “portrayer of manners and a satirist” (*Sittenmaler und Satiriker*), was thus constrained to write a Greek story to be faithful to the reality of Hellenization in Italy, and once having embarked on such a project, was forced to conceal his unquestionable “Italic nationality”, to which he nevertheless managed to give the fullest expression.⁴⁵⁹

To understand the modern anxiety at the root of the constitution of Mommsen’s Petronius, we will certainly benefit from paying less attention to the Roman socio-cultural background of the first century, and more attention to the revolutionary events taking place in central Europe in the third quarter of the nineteenth century. The man who invented the modern Petronius was a romantic nationalist and a self-confessed *animal politicum*,⁴⁶⁰ who had been exiled from Saxony in 1850 for the part he played in the struggle of philologists and other intellectuals for a unified greater Germany under Prussian leadership. At the time of writing the article on Petronius, Mommsen had been a National Liberal in the Prussian *Landtag* for five years, and his sympathies towards the recently victorious Italian *risorgimento* movement were obvious and derived from the kindred struggle of the two nationalist movements, the German and the Italian, at times against common enemies (e.g. the *Garibaldini* were greatly aided by Bismarck’s military successes in the Franco-Prussian war).

⁴⁵⁹ The term “Italic nationality” (*italische Nationalität*) in Mommsen’s text is meaningless, unless we understand it to be the ancient correlate of the fledgling Italian nationality. Mommsen’s English translator, W. P. Dickson (New York 1868), did not hesitate to translate “italische” with “Italian”.

⁴⁶⁰ In Mommsen’s own testament, Wucher 1956, 218f.

Mommsen's famous and widely successful *Römische Geschichte* (1854–56) was, rather than the history of that ancient empire, the history of the “Italic” nation from the earliest immigrations to the end of the Roman Republic. His interest in ancient history went beyond the scientific, and he consciously attempted to write a work of “political” history, which would focus on the significance of classical antiquity for his own times. Roman history was his subject of choice, principally because the Italic nation “alone among all the civilized nations of antiquity succeeded in constructing a national unity based on political independence” (*errang allein unter allen Kulturvölkern des Altertums bei einer auf Selbständigkeit ruhenden Verfassung die nationale Einheit*).⁴⁶¹ The terms used by the historian, “national unity” and “independence”, were the political buzzwords of the time.⁴⁶² The untenable antithesis in much of Mommsen's historical writing holds that “Roman” somehow stands for practical realism and a genius for state-building—his Napoleonic Caesar is *durch und durch Realist*—while “Greek” is seen as synonymous with fabulous story-telling and abstract philosophizing.⁴⁶³

Although Mommsen does not mention Petronius in his *Römische Geschichte*, he there molds Terentius Varro into a similar ancient Italian genius. It is Varro's composition of satires that provided the basis for turning him into a quintessential Roman author, despite ample evidence that he was adapting into Latin a Greek satirical genre. Petronius, likewise, could be recruited as the voice of the Italian nation, because of Bücheler's use of *Saturae* as the title of the work, instead of the Greek *Satyricon*, or the nominative *Satyrica* (which as a generic term refers to Greek “satyr plays”), and because this first modern editor of the work had related the work to the satirists Varro and Horace. Even preferring the Latin word to the Greek as the original title of the work is, however, not sufficient to preclude its association with Greek satiric genres, since ancient readers would have directly connected the satires of Petronius with those dissolute and shameless creatures named *σάτυροι* (cf. Schol. *Hor. Ep.* 1.11.12; Evanth. *de Com.* 2.5; Schol. *Pers. prol.* 1 and 11.8).⁴⁶⁴

Contrary to Casaubon's insistence on a clear differentiation, ancient authors tended closely to associate poetic satire, satyr plays and comedy, and

⁴⁶¹ *Römische Geschichte* 1854, 1:30.

⁴⁶² Wucher 1956, 63.

⁴⁶³ *Römische Geschichte* 1854, 3:450; Wucher 1956, 139f.

⁴⁶⁴ Henriksson 1956, 77, concludes in his study of Greek book-titles in Roman literature that the Roman readership of Petronius probably could not differentiate the meaning of the forms *Satiricon* and *Satyrica*, since there is no sign that such etymological understanding existed. In other words, satyrs and satire were closely related concepts.

never regarded these genres in terms of national identities. Accordingly, John the Lydian (*Mag.* 1.41) lists Petronius after Turnus and Juvenal, claiming that all three have violated the σατυρικὸς νόμος (“law of satire”) because of their invective. To his ancient audience Petronius may have been a satirist, but the broad term of “satire” could also include works like the *Cyclops* of Euripides, and a whole variety of other Greek genres. Satire and comedy in general are for the most part subversive genres and as such they often made communal Hellenic heroes and ideals the butt of their jokes and criticisms. The *persona* of the satirist requires a writer of satires to play an outsider in society, but this is a different status from being an insider in another society, and should also be carefully differentiated from nineteenth and twentieth-century grass roots and “volk”-culture.

No evidence, indeed, exists to support the wholesale identification of ancient satire as “Roman”. The much quoted phrase of Quintilian, *satira quidem tota nostra est* (*Inst.* 10.1.93.), merely refers to the hexameter satires of Lucilius, Horace and Persius. It follows the discussion of love elegy, in which genre Roman authors are said to have given Greek poets competition. For the rhetorician to say that hexameter satire is “all ours”, however, could well be ironic, considering the general Roman dislike of innovation and admiration for archaic traditions. Moreover, Quintilian’s claim, limited as it is, is contradicted from the Greek side by John the Lydian.⁴⁶⁵ A weightier testimony, perhaps, comes from Horace, who defines his own hexameter poems as *Bionei sermones* (*Ep.* 2.2.60),⁴⁶⁶ and claims, furthermore, that Lucilius, his Roman model, borrowed his wit and invective, if not the meter, from Greek Old Comedy.⁴⁶⁷ The hexameter, of course, shows that we are dealing essentially with a Greek poetic tradition adapted to Latin uses.⁴⁶⁸ No ancient

⁴⁶⁵ *Mag.* 1.41, τὸν Ῥίνθωνα, ὃς ἑξαμέτροις ἔγραψε πρῶτος κωμῳδίαν· ἐξ οὗ πρῶτος λαβὼν τὰς ἀφορμὰς Λουκίλιος ὁ Ῥωμαῖος ἠρωϊκοῖς ἔπεσιν ἐκωμῳδῆσεν. μεθ’ ὃν καὶ τοὺς μετ’ αὐτόν, οὗς καλοῦσι Ῥωμαῖοι σατυρικούς (“Rinthon was first to write comedy in hexameters. From him the Roman Lucilius was first to take inspiration and write comedy in heroic verses. After him, and those who came after him whom the Romans call satyrikoi ...”).

⁴⁶⁶ With reference to the Cynic diatribes of Bion, an Athenian (early third century B.C.). It is probable that some of Horace’s satires are straightforward adaptations of earlier works, e.g. *serm.* 2.5, which is a satirical νέκυνια in the manner of Menippus and other Cynics. On this aspect of Horace’s *Satires*, see recently Freudenberg 1993.

⁴⁶⁷ Hor. *S.* 1.4.1–6, *Eupolis atque Cratinus Aristophanesque poetae / atque alii, quorum comœdia prisca virorum est [...]/ hinc omnis pendet Lucilius, hosce secutus / mutatis tantum pedibus numerisque* (“Eupolis, Cratinus and Aristophanes and other creators of ancient comedy, on these Lucilius was completely dependent, then he followed changing only the meters”).

⁴⁶⁸ Besides Bion, Timon of Phlius (ca. 320–230 B.C.E.) also wrote satirical hexameter poems (including dialogues). Known as ὁ σὺλλογράφος, he was of skeptical philosophical inclina-

authority, moreover, claims that the Cynic mixture of prose and poetry, that “other and even older kind of satire” (*alterum illud etiam prius satirae genus*),⁴⁶⁹ was in any sense a Roman creation, or in any way reflected a specifically Roman or Italian outlook on life.

The next big step in the modern interpretation of the *Satyrica* was directly influenced by the arrival on the scene of a new manner of writing, documentary Naturalism. In Germany this movement was heralded by pamphlets demanding a new scientific objectivity in literature. The principal model was Emile Zola and the organs of the movement were such journals as the *Kritische Waffengänge* (1882–84) in Berlin, and *Die Gesellschaft* (1885–1902) in Munich. Among the moderately progressive philologists of the day some apprehension was apparently felt that the heritage of classicism and romanticism was in danger of being discredited. This concern at least inspired Elimar Klebs to formulate the first explicit thesis about the composition of the *Satyrica*, in his classic article, “Zur Composition von Petronius Satirae” (1889).

Klebs’ Petronius is simply “the strongest realist of antiquity” (*der stärkste Realist des Alterthums*) as well as a satirical genius whose great achievement is to have given “artistic character” (*künstlerische Charakter*) to “realism” (*Realismus*), in contrast with the writers of Klebs’ own time, who “merely share with Petronius the long-winded treatment of smut” (*die mit ihm nur die breite Behandlung des Schmutzes gemein haben*). For Klebs, no attempt is necessary to explain the existence of a realistic novel in antiquity, and so he grants a degree of universality to this predominant form of his times which enables it to transcend the constraints of literary history. Klebs nevertheless notes the similarities of Encolpius’ narrative *persona* (an intelligent and well educated person telling the story of his wanderings and chaotic adventures outside the reach of law and civilization) to that of Lucius, in the Greek Ass-Story and the *Metamorphoses* of Apuleius. But he also finds a partial analogy in the *Satyrica* with the picaresque novel of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Neither link, however, is seen to have literary-historical implications other than demonstrating the universality of the form.

Contrary to what Klebs’ argument has come to represent in the later scholarship,⁴⁷⁰ his intention was not to argue that Petronius was offering a prosaic parody or travesty of such epic poems as the *Odyssey* or the *Aeneid*:

tion and a follower of Pyrrho. Timon also, typically, wrote satyr plays and cinaedic poetry.

⁴⁶⁹ Quint. *Inst.* 10.1.95.

⁴⁷⁰ E.g. Perry (1967), 186, ‘another sees in it a parody on the epic’, with a footnote reference to Klebs’ article.

Daran wird natürlich kein Verständiger denken, daß es Petrons Absicht gewesen sei eine prosaische Travestie zu den Gesängen vom Zorn Poseidons oder Junos zu schreiben. Ein Werk mit einer solchen Fülle lebensvoller Schilderungen der Wirklichkeit erhebt von selber dagegen Einspruch, unter die reinen Literatur-Satiren eingereiht zu werden.⁴⁷¹

According to Klebs, then, rather than creating a prose parody of epic, Petronius merely used an epic structure in the *Satyrica* for the purpose of achieving “inner unity” (*innerer Einheit*) for the otherwise loosely structured realistic portrayal of his times.

Klebs’ once influential thesis, which postulates an over-arching epic theme of divine wrath in the *Satyrica*, was in part an expansion of Bücheler’s suggestion that the fragment from Sidonius Apollinaris (*Fr.* IV) might be seen as an indication of Priapic involvement in the story as early as the opening episode in Massalia. To this Klebs added several instances in the extant text where Priapus seems to have a role in the plot. Hence, he concluded that the strife between Encolpius and Priapus was a unifying motif of great importance in the original story. He also drew attention to the many parodic allusions to Greek myth and Roman legends which serve the same purpose, especially allusions to the Homeric *Odyssey*, as for instance in the comic recognition scene where Lichas identifies the bald and shaven Encolpius by his prick and the narrator explicitly compares this to Odysseus’ more heroic recognition by his scar (*Od.* 19.386–507).

The purpose of such parody in the *Satyrica*, according to Klebs, is to express, by way of irony, the narrator’s awareness of his pathetic humiliation. This irony is both sophisticated and self-conscious and therefore resembles the narrative posturing frequently assumed by modern novelists. To buttress his claim, Klebs highlights the ironic pathos of the narrator where it finds its clearest articulation, in the poem in 139.2 where Encolpius states that the *gravis ira Priapi* signifies for him what the fateful wrath of Poseidon meant for Odysseus (*der Zorn des Priapus bedeutet für Encolpios Schicksale, was Poseidons Zorn für Odysseus*). Klebs, in effect, privileges this particular poem and uses it as master text for interpreting the whole of the *Satyrica*. According to Klebs, by giving the “I-novel” (*Ich-Roman*) of Encolpius an epic structure, Petronius endowed his *Realismus* with “artistic character” (*künstlerischer Charakter*). This supposed achievement of the ancient author is then promoted as the ideal for contemporary writers, an

⁴⁷¹ Klebs (1889), 630.

esthetic reconciliation between unrestrained modernity and a possibly endangered classical tradition.

3.2.3 Milesian Fiction

The general attempt, however, to enlist Petronius on the side of progress and innovation in the great modern struggle of ideas did not win immediate and uncritical acceptance. One scholar in particular, Karl Bürger, in the article ‘Der Antike Roman vor Petronius’,⁴⁷² made difficult for a while the visionary reinterpretation of Petronius by mounting historically and philologically viable counter-arguments, although these ultimately failed to win the day, because, as it appears, they did not hold out equally exciting promises of interpretation to his more progressive colleagues. The more than eleven decades that have passed since Bürger published his article have of course made it dated in some respects. In the following section I shall therefore restate, revise and supplement Bürger’s arguments, which, in my view, are nevertheless basically still valid.

The tone of Bürger’s article is polemical, but not offensive, and the reader gets the impression that he was carefully trying to correct a picture of the ancient novel which he considered flawed despite its having been embraced by the philological community at large. He begins by sketching the exaggerated picture of two radically different ancient novel genres, which according to him had already become scholarly “dogma” (*ist es zum Dogma geworden*) through the publication of Rohde’s *Der griechische Roman* (1876). According to this picture, we have on the one hand a sentimental and fabulous Greek romance, regarded as the creation of the Second Sophistic, and on the other the supposedly unrelated *Satirae* of Petronius, regarded as “the remnants of a genuinely realistic novel of manners” (*die Trümmer eines echt realistischen Sittenromans*) without any antecedents in Greek literature. Bürger tells the story of Thiele’s unhappy earlier attempt to address the problems of this unlikely dichotomy,⁴⁷³ and expresses optimism that a better argued and more detailed demonstration of the existence before Petronius of “realistic Greek novels” (*realistischer griechischer Romane*) will win followers among scholars.⁴⁷⁴

⁴⁷² Bürger 1892, 345–58

⁴⁷³ Thiele 1890, 124.

⁴⁷⁴ The sequence of this scholarly controversy is the following: Thiele 1890, Bürger 1892, Susemihl 1892, Thiele 1893, Rohde 1893, 125–39, Schmid 1904, 471–85, and Reitzenstein 1906, 91–99.

Bürger is generally favorable to Klebs' thesis and seems to agree on the issue of epic structure and especially on the similarity of the *Satyrica* to the Spanish picaresque novel, and he rejects as insufficient Rohde's attempts to derive it from Menippean satire. Bürger argues that a novel of such size (at least seventeen books) and technical virtuosity as the *Satyrica* cannot, any more than other great works of literature, have been created out of nothing, and is more easily accounted for if we assume that it follows a whole series of similar works, even if these were of a lesser size and inferior artistic quality. Whether such early novels were written in Latin or Greek he deems to be of little importance, although on the analogy of the rest of Roman literary compositions the conclusion that this genre as well was initiated in Greek might be arrived at through inductive reasoning.⁴⁷⁵ He raises objections to the "more commonly expressed opinion" that the *Satyrica* contains a specifically "Italic" character (*Man hat freilich öfter die Meinung ausgesprochen, grade Petrons Werk trage einen spezifische italischen Character*), a view that he traces to Mommsen's article.⁴⁷⁶ Bürger points out that the arguments advanced in support of the "Italic" character of the *Satyrica*, which typically rely on the presence of "vulgar" Latin idioms in the diction,⁴⁷⁷ misconstrue what is merely a Greek technique of imitating linguistic mannerisms, well known in Hellenistic authors like Theocritus and Herondas.

In order to establish the early existence of prose narratives in the style of Petronius, Bürger begins by revisiting the argument which Thiele had used before him and finds in Cicero's *De inventione* (1.19.27) and the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* (1.8.12) a description of a general, non-judicial,⁴⁷⁸ artistic *narratio in personis* with a plot and a narrative technique which he takes to indicate that the pathetic comic novel was well established already in the first century B.C.E.:

illa autem narratio, quae versatur in personis, eius modi est, ut in ea simul cum rebus ipsis personarum sermones et animi perspicui possint, hoc modo:

venit ad me saepe clamans: "quid agis Micio?"

⁴⁷⁵ This reasoning, despite relying on an undeniable general trend in classical literary history, not only outraged Rohde in 1893, it is still treated as "bias" by some scholars today; see Stephens and Winkler 1995, 364f., and Schmeling 1996a, 480.

⁴⁷⁶ For this view, see, e.g., Heinze 1899, 506 n.1; Müller 1983, 496.

⁴⁷⁷ Probably an indirect reference to Studer 1849.

⁴⁷⁸ Cic. *Inv.* 1.19.17, *tertium genus [sc. narrationis] remotum a civilibus causis* ("a third type of narration is unconnected with public issues"); *Rhet. Her.* 1.8.12, *tertium genus est id, quod a causa civili remotum est* ("a third type is that which is unconnected with public issues").

cur perdis adulescentem nobis? cur amat?
 cur potat? cur tu his rebus sumptum suggeris?
 vestitu nimium indulges, nimium ineptus es.”

Nimium ipse est durus praeter aequumque et bonum. [Ter. *Ad.* 60ff.]
 Hoc in genere narrationis multa debet inesse festivitas confecta ex rerum
 varietate, animorum dissimilitudine, gravitate, levitate, spe, metu, suspi-
 cione, desiderio, dissimulatione, errore, misericordia, fortunae commuta-
 tione, insperato incommodo, subita laetitia, iucundo exitu rerum. (Cic.
Inv. 1.19.27)

But the form of narrative which employs speaking *personae* is of such a
 sort that in it can be seen not only events but also the conversation and
 attitudes of the speaking *personae*, in this way:

He always comes to me, crying, “What are you doing, Micio?
 Why are you ruining the boy for us? Why does he fall in love?
 Why does he drink? Why are you footing the bill for these things?
 You indulge him too much in clothes, it’s completely idiotic of you.”
 He himself is extremely hard, beyond what is just and good.

In this form of narrative there should be great liveliness, resulting from
 variety of events, contrast of characters, severity, levity, hope, fear, suspi-
 cion, desire, deception, error, compassion, change of fortune, unex-
 pected trouble, sudden joy, and a happy ending.

Whereas Thiele had constructed his thesis on the basis of a certain under-
 standing of the sometimes problematic terminology of ancient rhetorical
 theory, Bürger stresses simply that the passage above shows the existence,
 already in the first century B.C.E., of entertaining narratives with a variety of
 subject-matter and an emphasis on atmosphere or emotional states that fi-
 nally result in a happy ending.⁴⁷⁹ Although Bürger takes this theoretical pas-
 sage to be a direct description of the ancient novel, which is possible, many
 of the features could apply to literary narrative in general such as epic poetry
 and even history.⁴⁸⁰ However, the emphasis on plot, character, pathos and
 happy ending does not fit epic and history all that well. As Richard Reitzen-
 stein noted, the oldest extant narrative which certainly conforms to this de-

⁴⁷⁹ Cf. Cic. *Part.* 9.32, *suavis autem narratio est, quae habet admirationes, expectationes, exitus inopinatos, interpositos motus animorum, colloquia personarum, dolores, iracundias, metus, laetitias, cupiditates* (“A narrative is sweet when it contains expressions of admira-
 tion, suspense, unexpected outcome, a sprinkling of emotional turmoil, character dialogues,
 suffering, anger, fear, joy, desires”).

⁴⁸⁰ Cf. Cicero’s letter to Lucceius, on writing history (*Fam.* 5.12).

scription is Chariton's *Callirhoë*.⁴⁸¹ But character speeches may not be the distinct feature of the extant Greek novels. As we saw in sections 1.2.1 and 3.1.4 the model offered by the *narratio in personis* of the rhetorical treatise actually accounts for the narrative structure of the *Satyrical* and the *Metamorphoses* of Apuleius. Even if Cicero's example, taken from New Comedy, is somewhat confusing, the fact that Micio's long expository narrative from the first act of the play is here used to illustrate narration appears to show that we are supposed to ignore the larger dramatic form. What Cicero wishes to illustrate is Micio's impersonation *qua* narrator of his brother Demea.

But as Bürger points out we do not have to rely on rhetorical theory alone because luckily both names of authors and titles of novelistic narratives are extant. The oldest known "lasciviously erotic novel of manners" (*lasciv erotischen Sittenroman*), he argues, was the *Μιλησιακά* of Aristides, a work written some time before 78 B.C.E. when Lucius Cornelius Sisenna (ca. 120-67 B.C.E.), its Latin adaptor/translator, was praetor. Bürger now advances compelling arguments to the effect that contrary to the prevailing opinion—still widespread in the scholarship—the *Μιλησιακά* was not a simple collection of erotic "short stories", or *novelle*, but no less a novelistic narrative than the Milesian *Metamorphoses* of Apuleius. A great deal of the misunderstanding about the form, Bürger argues, derives from the association of "Milesian tales" with Boccaccio's *Decamerone*, a collection of proper *novelle* embedded in a larger but distinct and static narrative frame.⁴⁸² This misunderstanding follows almost automatically from the use of the generic term *novella* in this context.⁴⁸³

Bürger notes that the opening sentence of Apuleius' Latin adaptation of the *Μεταμορφώσεις*, *At ego tibi sermone isto Milesio varias fabulas con-*

⁴⁸¹ Reitzenstein 1906, 94–96.

⁴⁸² Bürger was directly arguing against Rohde's 1885, 66–91, historicist reading of the Apuleian work as quasi-autobiographical narrative. For the use of the *Decamerone* to explain the structure of the work of Aristides, see e.g. Schmid 1904, 474: "einem Werk, das man nach allem, was wir darüber wissen, als eine Novellensammlung, einen antiken Decamerone betrachten muß."

⁴⁸³ *Novelle* in a narrative frame are not Greco-Roman in origin but believed to be an Oriental narrative figure, first introduced to the West in the twelfth century through the cycle of the 'Seven Sages'. It is from this origin that medieval scholars ultimately derive the frame narrative in Boccaccio's *Decamerone*, from the middle of the fourteenth century, and Chaucer's *Canterbury Tales*, from the late fourteenth century. The German literary form called *Novellen* which flourished in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries in the works of writers such as Heinrich von Kleist, J. W. von Goethe and Gerhart Hauptmann is derived from Boccaccio's *Decamerone*. Like the prototype, German *Novellen* were often encompassed within a frame story based on a striking news item (plague, war, or flood), either real or imaginary. Many of these collections were simply called *Novellen*.

seram (“But I would like to weave together for you various stories in the Milesian discourse you know so well”), is regularly misinterpreted by scholars, since the adjective *Milesius*—which presumably derives from the title of Sisenna’s Latin adaptation of the *Μιλησιακά* rather than directly from the Greek work—stands with the singular *sermo* and does not qualify the plural *variae fabulae*. The only way to make *Milesius* qualify *variae fabulae* is to take it as an adverbial phrase with *conseram*. But why should we do so when it more naturally stands with *sermo*? Furthermore, the word *fabula* in the *Metamorphoses* (1.1), although often used in reference to smaller narratives told by the main narrator, frequently in the *personae* of subordinate narrators, is not by any means the semantic equivalent of the generic term “short story” or *novella*.⁴⁸⁴

We may add that the principal meaning of *fabula* [*<fari*] agrees closely with *sermo*, which explains why Apuleius uses the word to denote a specifically oral and therefore presumably “unreliable” or “unstable” quality in narrative,⁴⁸⁵ in contradistinction to written and therefore permanently fixed *historia*.⁴⁸⁶ The *Metamorphoses*, of course, are both a *lepidus susurrus* (“pretty whisper”), and therefore a *fabula*, and a *papyrus inscripta* (“written on papyrus”), and therefore a *historia*.⁴⁸⁷ Hence Apuleius’ promise to the reader to “weave together various stories” (1.1, *varias fabulas conserere*) is properly a generic description of the *Metamorphoses*, which describes the

⁴⁸⁴ *Fabula*, of course, often means only “play”. A quick look at the *Metamorphoses* shows that even the most general term in English, such as “story”, does not fully capture the meaning of *fabula*; in fact, the singular is not used consistently to denote a distinct narrative (e.g., the old woman refers to the story of Psyche in the plural, as *fabulae*, 4.28), and various connotations are possible: “talk” (1.25), “chat” (1.25), “account” (4.30, 9.17, 9.23), “gossip” (5.31, 6.23), “comedy” (10.2), and “adventure” (11.20).

⁴⁸⁵ Cf. Isid. *Etym.* 1.40.1, *fabulas poetae a fando nominaverunt, quia non sunt res factae, sed tantum loquendo fictae* (“The poets derived the name of fables from the verb *fari*, ‘to speak’, because they are not events that have happened, but only made up in the act of speaking”).

⁴⁸⁶ *Met.* 1.1: *At ego tibi ... uarias fabulas conseram auresque tuas beniuolas lepido susurro permulceam* (“But I would like ... to weave together for you various stories and to caress your ears into approval with a pretty whisper”); 6.29: *in fabulis audietur doctorumque stilis rudis perpetuabitur historia* (“It will be heard in fables and learned men will employ their pens to make this unpolished tale into a classic history”); 8.1: *referam uobis a capite quae gesta sunt quaeque possint merito doctores, quibus stilos fortuna subministrat, in historiae specimen chartis inuoluere* (“I shall relate to you from the start what happened, and more learned men, to whom fortune has granted penmanship, may with merit put it into writing in the form of a history”).

⁴⁸⁷ *Met.* 2.12: *historiam magnam et incredundam fabulam et libros me futurum* (“I will become a long history, an unbelievable fable, a book in several volumes”).

work as a miscellany of interwoven narratives. This description may have been a part of the prologue of the original Greek Ass-Story, which seems reflected in Photios' description of the work.⁴⁸⁸ The phrase *varietas rerum* in Cicero's theoretical description of the non-judicial *narratio in personis* seems to be a similar generic description, and the same can be said of Apuleius' mention of *historiae variae rerum* (*Fl.* 9) among his works, which is best taken as a reference to his novelistic writings. There is reliable evidence, moreover, that the characteristic diversity of the literary form of *Milesia* involved a variety of discursive form no less than a variety of content.⁴⁸⁹

The singular *sermo Milesius* (1.1), therefore, means here roughly the same as *fabula Milesia*, which agrees in general with the consistent self-referential terminology in Apuleius' work. The work as a whole is referred to at different points in the story as *fabula Graecanica* (1.1),⁴⁹⁰ *incredunda fabula* (2.12), *Milesia* [*sc. fabula*] (4.32), and simply *fabula* (10.2, 10.33).⁴⁹¹ Bürger notes that the term *historia* is normal in references to works of this kind, although he makes no attempt to differentiate its meaning from *fabula* ("written" versus "spoken") on the basis of Apuleius' usage, since he is more concerned with their general interchangeability. That view is seen to be valid at least if one judges by the internal references in the text of the *Metamorphoses* (2.12, *historiam magnam*; 6.29, *historia*; and 8.1, *historiae specimen*), which show that Apuleius uses both *fabula* and *historia* to refer to the story as a whole. It follows, then, that Apuleius considered his adaptation of the Μεταμορφώσεις to be of the same genre as the Μιλησιακά, which accordingly must have been an extended narrative performance with a central *fabula* that gave unity to the whole.

⁴⁸⁸ Photius (*Bibl. Cod.* 129) describes the original Μεταμορφώσεις as "various tales", λόγοι διάφοροι, and says about both Greek Ass-Stories that "the stories by both authors were stuffed with fictional fables", γέμει δὲ ὁ ἑκατέρου λόγος πλασμάτων μὲν μυθικῶν, though the description seems to fit the epitome less well, since it was probably made simply by pruning off the subordinate narratives and abbreviating the central *fabula*.

⁴⁸⁹ Martianus Capella *de Nupt.* 2.100, *nam certe mythos, poeticae etiam diversitatis delicias Milesias historiasque mortalium, postquam supera conscenderit, se penitus amissuram non cassa opinione formidat* ("She feared, not without substance, that she would certainly have to forgo mythical fabrications, and even the poetic diversity of delightful *Milesiae* and the histories of mortals, after she had ascended to the sky [to marry a god]"). Philologia is speaking, and the reference is weightier because Capella's work itself is prosimetric.

⁴⁹⁰ The meaning of the adjective *Graecanica* is "adapted into Latin from Greek" (*Var. L.* 10.70–71). The phrase is therefore best taken as a definition of the Latin version of the Greek *Metamorphoses*.

⁴⁹¹ Bürger does not say that the whole work is referred to as *fabula*, but only as *Milesia* (Bürger 1892, 353 n.1), which is incorrect and damages the viability of the argument.

A reference to Aristides in the Lucianic corpus supports Bürger's interpretation that the work of Sisenna was of a similar structure to the *Metamorphoses*, viz., a main story told in the first person with various subordinate narratives interwoven into the central fable (Pseudo-Lucian *Am.* 1). The passage (discussed in detail below) implies that Aristides first heard and then retold the Μιλησιακά, which shows that the form of the work was that of personal recollections. Such a narrative would aptly be termed *narratio in personis*, according to ancient narrative theory, since the main narrator represents himself in the past of the story as witness or audience to the narratives of other *personae* whom he then impersonates in the present while retelling the same material to his own audience. Given this form of the narrative we can perhaps interpret Ovid's obscure reference to Aristides' work, *iunxit Aristides Milesia crimina secum*—"Aristides associated delinquent Milesian behavior with his own person" (*Tr.* 2.413) as reflecting that narrative structure. Ovid is not interested in the narrative structure of the Μιλησιακά as such, but in the relevance of Aristides' case to his own, viz. that Aristides did what Ovid had done, i.e. wrote about delinquent behavior under his own name but did not suffer Ovid's fate. Nevertheless, the wording of Ovid's verse goes beyond just saying that Aristides authored an immoral work, and it begs the question how exactly Aristides "associated delinquent Milesian behavior with his own person". The answer to this question may be gleaned in the reference to Sisenna's Latin adaptation of Aristides' Μιλησιακά which follows a few lines later in Ovid's poetic apology, *vertit Aristidem Sisenna, nec obfuit illi / historiae turpes inseruisse iocos*—"Sisenna translated Aristides, and no one held it against him to have woven shameless jokes into his story" (*Tr.* 2.443–4). The word *historia* is here better taken as a reference to the *Milesiae*, also called *Milesia historia*, than to Sisenna's historical writings. The figurative language in Ovid's phrases, *iunxit ... Milesia crimina secum* and *historiae inseruisse turpes iocos*, is barely intelligible unless we understand these to be generic references to the narrative structure of *fabula Milesia*. The language seems to imply that although the phrases *milesia crimina* and *turpis ioci* appear to refer to short and obscene anecdotes, these shorter narratives were not isolated and autonomous but a) associated in some way with the person of Aristides, who was evidently the narrator of both the Greek and the Latin works, and b) woven into the main story, the history.

When read side by side with the prologue of the *Metamorphoses*, where the author promises the reader to "weave together various stories" (1.1, *varias fabulas conserere*), and with the "comparison text" of the Lucianic description of "Aristides being enchanted beyond measure by those Milesian

stories”, the pieces of this fragmented description of a lost novel fall into place quite naturally. The picture that emerges is of a work that was not a collection of short stories, but a first-person novel, more specifically a travelogue told from memory by a narrator who every now and then would relate how he encountered other characters who told him stories which he would then incorporate into the main tale through narrative impersonation. The result is a complicated narrative fabric carried by a main narrator with numerous subordinate tales carried by subordinate narrative voices. On its own this assembled jigsaw puzzle would not amount to much if we didn’t have one partially preserved and one fully extant exemplar of the form in the *Satyrical* of Petronius and the *Metamorphoses* of Apuleius respectively. The virtuosity of narrative technique in works of this genre was evidently a defining characteristic and much admired, and seems to have prompted the above attempts to describe it.

Unfortunately there is only a single word extant from the actual text of the *Μιλησιακά* preserved by a first or second-century lexicographer. It is a simple gloss, which, depending on manuscript readings, derives either from the third or the sixth book of the original *Μιλησιακά*.⁴⁹² Of the Latin adaptation by Sisenna we have only a little more, ten fragments in all, preserved by a Latin grammarian writing in 361-363 C.E.⁴⁹³ These ten fragments bear witness that the work contained erotic dialogues (a woman planting a kiss on her interlocutor in fragment eight) and complaints over the travesty of justice (fragment seven), but what might seem like a first person travelogue (fragment three) is clearly not spoken by the narrator but a character. Some poetic diction was also found therein (fragment one), which led Bücheler and Nor-

⁴⁹² The fragment is from the lexicon of Harpocration and runs like this: [Δ 23]: δερμηστής, “skineater” [i.e. a worm that eats skin] (from book 3 or 6 of *Μιλησιακά*).

⁴⁹³ Charisius’ *Ars Grammatica* (GL. 194K–259, 25B). The fragments are numbered according to Bücheler’s edition (Berlin 1862). 1. *nocte vagatrix* (“she who wanders at night”). 2. *Te istuc hesterno quaesisse oportuerat, Ariste?* (“What reason did you have yesterday, Aristos, to ask for this?”). 3. *“Eamus ad ipsum.” Atque ipse commode de parte superiore descendebat* (“Let us go to himself.’ And just at the right moment he came down from the upper part”). 4. *Quid nunc ostium scalpis? Quid tergiversaris nec bene nauiter is?* (“Why do you now scratch the entrance, why don’t you turn back and proceed directly?”). 5. *Obviam venit* (“He/she appeared opposite”). 6. *confestim secuta est* (“she immediately followed”). 7. *que iudicium false factum* (“a lawsuit falsely made”). 8. *“Nisi comminus excidisset, quanti dantur?” “Tanti,” inquit Olumpias; simul hoc dicens suavium dedit* (“If it hadn’t been immediately forgotten, how much do they cost?” ‘So much,’ said Olympias, and as she spoke she planted a kiss”). 9. *“Proin dato aliquid,” inquit, “quod domi habebis, quod tibi non magno stabit”* (“So then you will pay with something you have at home’ he/she said, ‘it’s something that will not cost you much”). 10. *Ut eum paenitus utero suo recepit* (“As she received him deep inside her womb”).

den to think that the *Milesiae* were prosimetric like the *Satyrica* of Petronius. There were also graphic descriptions of sexual acts (fragment ten), but it is not clear that intercourse between a donkey and a woman is being referred to, despite the similarities with Apuleius' *Metamorphoses* 10.22, because Apuleius' hypotext is still extant in the Pseudo-Lucianic Greek Ass-Story (51). As one would expect the Latin *Milesiae* or *Milesiarum libri*—such was the title of Sisenna's adaptation—was populated by characters with Greek names (Olympias and Aristos), which, as we have seen, is true also of the *Satyrica* of Petronius and the *Metamorphoses* of Apuleius, and is in general symptomatic of Roman adaptations of Greek texts. But unfortunately there is no information to be had from here about the narrative structure.

If, however, we look closer at the Pseudo-Lucianic *Amores* we shall find therein a third text that exemplifies to some extent the genre in question and is clearly designed to imitate the narrative structure of the *Μιλησιακά*. Bürger certainly did not work this material for what it was worth. The Greek name of the Pseudo-Lucianic dialogue, *Erotes* (Ἔρωτες), which is rather misleadingly translated in the Loeb as “Affairs of the Heart”, really means “Loves” in the plural, which could mean “Love Stories” or possibly “Two Types of Love”, with a reference to the ancient topos of comparing the relative merits of having sex with women and boys, an important topic in the *Erotes*. In what we shall see is a programmatic statement, Lycinus begins the dialogue as if in the middle of a conversation by thanking Theomnestus, his friend, for his entertaining stream of erotic narratives:

“Ἐρωτικῆς παιδιᾶς, ἑταῖρέ μοι Θεόμνηστε, ἐξ ἔωθινοῦ πεπλήρωκας ἡμῶν τὰ κεκτηκότα πρὸς τὰς συνεχεῖς σπουδὰς ὧτα, καὶ μοι σφόδρα διψῶντι τοιαύτης ἀνέσεως εὐκαιρος ἢ τῶν ἰλαρῶν σου λόγων ἐρρῦη χάρις· [...] πάνυ δὴ με ὑπὸ τὸν ὄρθρον ἢ τῶν ἀκολάστων σου διηγημάτων αἰμύλη καὶ γλυκεῖα πειθῶ κατεύφραγκεν, ὥστ' ὀλίγου δεῖν Ἀριστείδης ἐνόμιζον εἶναι τοῖς Μιλησιακοῖς λόγοις ὑπερκηλούμενος, ἄχθομαί τε νῆ τοὺς σοὺς ἔρωτας, οἷς πλατὺς εὐρέθης σκοπός, ὅτι πέπαυσαι διηγούμενος· καί σε πρὸς αὐτῆς ἀντιβολουμέν Ἀφροδίτης, εἰ περιττά με λέγειν ἕοικας, εἴ τις ἄρρηγ ἢ καὶ νῆ Δία θῆλυς ἀφεῖται σοι πόθος, ἡρέμα τῇ μνήμῃ ἐκκαλέσασθαι.”

“Theomnestus my friend, since dawn your sportive talk about love has filled these ears of mine that were weary of unremitting attention to serious topics. As I was parched with thirst for relaxation of this sort, your delightful stream of merry fables was very welcome to me [...] This morning I have been quite gladdened by the sweet winning seductiveness

of your wanton narratives, so that I almost thought I was Aristides being enchanted beyond measure by those Milesian fables, and I swear by those Loves of yours that have found so broad a target, that I am indeed sorry that you've stopped narrating. If you think this is but idle talk on my part, I beg you in the name of Aphrodite herself, if you've omitted mention of any of your love affairs with a lad or even, by Zeus, with a girl, coax it forth with the aid of memory."⁴⁹⁴

We have here a reference to the *Μιλησιακά* of Aristides not under its customary title, but as *Μιλησιακοὶ λόγοι* ("Milesian fables") and they are compared to Theomnestus' delightful stream of *ἴλαροὶ λόγοι*, ("merry fables"), which is again referred to as *ἀκολάστα διηγημάτα*, ("unbridled narratives"). Plutarch (*Crassus* 32.3–5) also uses the same adjective, *ἀκολάστος* ("unbridled"), three times in his reference to the work of Aristides. In fact, at another point in the *Erotes* itself the adjective *ἀκολάστος* is used of the obscene paintings on the ceramics of the local potters in Cnidos. As a description of the plurality of the stories in the *Μιλησιακά* of Aristides, the Lucianic one squares remarkably well with Ovid's references to *Milesia crimina* and *turpis ioci*.

Lycinus, who has described in programmatic language how Theomnestus' talk about love has filled his ears with a delightful stream of merry fables, here fancies himself to be like Aristides who is enchanted beyond measure by the Milesian fables. Aristides who was the writer or at least the narrator of the presumably many narratives of the *Μιλησιακά* is described as listening to and being entertained by those same narratives. This calls for an explanation, for we would expect a writer to be said to relate his own work but not to listen to his own work. As we shall see there is only one ancient narrative form that could make the narrator also an audience to the story he is telling. This form is the first person recollection narrative *in personis*, indeed a form in which the main bulk of the *Erotes* is cast.

The beginning five chapters, which are a dialogue between Lycinus and Theomnestus, are only an introduction to Lycinus' recollection of a trip he once took with his friends to Italy, which takes over in chapter six and runs through to chapter fifty-three, where the dialogue with Theomnestus is resumed and finished in merely two chapters. It is precisely the use of the Milesian discourse in the main bulk of the *Erotes* itself that prompts the programmatic reference to the *Μιλησιακά* of Aristides at the beginning. Lycinus first challenges Theomnestus to recall and narrate more stories of his erotic

⁴⁹⁴ The translation is based on that of MacLeod in the Loeb.

affairs, but Theomnestus' repertory of love stories has run dry and he cannot continue. Much is said of the pleasant act of recollecting one's love affairs, and Lycinus says to Theomnestus: "you made it immediately plain from your very manner that you were in love not only with your loves but also with their memory. Come if there is any scrap of your voyage in the seas of love that you have omitted, reveal everything."⁴⁹⁵ But Theomnestus declines to tell more stories and responds to Lycinus: "Because my narratives have continued since dawn and lasted too long, let *your* Muse, departing from her usual seriousness, spend the day in merriment."⁴⁹⁶ And so Lycinus takes over and embarks on his own narrative voyage, weaving into his main travelogue one erotic anecdote and two erotic speeches, while continuously hinting that he heard many more stories on the way that he is simply not telling us at this time.

The narrative of Lycinus is thus introduced in the framing dialogue as Lycinus' response to Theomnestus' long "Hesiodic catalogue" (ὥς παρ' Ἡσιόδῳ κατάλογον) of erotic affairs that was explicitly compared to the Μιλησιακά. It is in this parallel narrative structure of the *Erotes* that we get the explanation of how Aristides could both narrate the stories of the Μιλησιακά and be the charmed listener of the stories contained in it, for Lycinus says he is relating from memory the stories and speeches of other people who told him of their affairs sometime in the past: "The imprint of their words," he says just before he begins his tale, "remains inscribed in my ears almost as though they had been spoken a moment ago. Therefore [...] I shall retail to you exactly what I heard them say."⁴⁹⁷

If the unbridled stories, *alias* Milesian crimes, *alias* lewd jests of the Μιλησιακά were presented in the same manner as Lycinus proceeds to present his own "voyage in the seas of love," then we can easily understand how, in Ovid's words, Aristides "associated", *iunxit*, himself with Milesian crimes, and Sisenna "wove lewd jests into the story", i.e., Aristides' *historia*. For Aristides does not only tell in his own person a string of stories, he connects himself with or involves himself in these stories by representing himself in the past as meeting the story-tellers and listening to their tales, which

⁴⁹⁵ *Amores* 3, "ἀπ' αὐτοῦ τοῦ σχήματος εὐθὺς δῆλος ἦς οὐκ ἐκείνων μόνων, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῆς ἐπ' αὐτοῖς μνήμης ἐρών. ἀλλ', εἴ τί σοι τοῦ κατὰ τὴν Ἀφροδίτην περίπλου λείψανον ἀφεῖται, μηδὲν ἀποκρύψῃ."

⁴⁹⁶ *Amores* 4, "αἶ μὲν ἐμαὶ διηγήσεις ἐξ ἑωθινοῦ παραταθεῖσαι κόρον ἔχουσιν, ἡ δὲ σὴ Μοῦσα τῆς συνήθους μεθαρμοσαμένη σπουδῆς ἰλαρῶς τῷ θεῷ συνδιημερευσάτω."

⁴⁹⁷ *Amores* 5, "καί μοι τὰ τῶν λόγων ἕχνη ταῖς ἀκοαῖς ἐνεσφράγισται σχεδὸν ὡς ἀρτίως εἰρημένα ... ἃ παρ' ἀμφοῖν ἦκουσα λεγόντων κατ' ἀκριβὲς ἐπέξιμί σοι."

he in turn recollects for his own audience. We note the “spoken” presentation of this text, which seems to be the norm in Milesian fiction.

If we continue to look at the *Erotes* as a text that reflects the structure of Milesian fiction, the most striking quality of Lycinus’ first person recollection is that it is in the form of a travelogue, just like the works of Petronius and Apuleius. The opening words, “I had in mind going to Italy and a swift ship had been made ready for me” (*Amores* 6, Ἐπ’ Ἰταλίαν μοι διανοουμένῳ ταχυναντοῦν σκάφος εὐτρέπιστο), are not only reminiscent of the beginning of the archetypal travelogue of Odysseus in the *Odyssey*, they bear a strong resemblance to Loukios’ opening line in the Greek Ass-Story, “Once upon a time I was on my way to Thessaly” (Ἀπήειν ποτὲ ἐς Θεσσαλίαν), as well as the words of the same character in Apuleius’ version, “I was traveling on business to Thessaly” (*Thessaliam* ... *ex negotio petebam*). The frame into which Lycinus weaves his single erotic novella and two speeches is therefore a linear progression in geographical space, a sort of road or voyage novel. Lycinus sets out from Antioch in Syria, where he is escorted to his ship by “a throng of determined scholars” (ἠκολούθει δὲ παιδείας λιπαρῆς ὄχλος), and the route he follows leads him along the southern seaboard of Asia Minor and across the gulf of Pamphylia to Lycia, where he says they visited each of the Lycian cities where they “found pleasure in the fables told, for no vestige of prosperity is visible in them to the eye” (μύθοις τὰ πολλὰ χαίροντες· οὐδὲν γὰρ ἐν αὐταῖς σαφὲς εὐδαιμονίας ὄραται λείψανον). The Lycian cities, six in number, were ancient Greek colonies. The description of decaying cities which have nothing left but tales to tell of former days of glory could also fit Miletus easily and the erotic stories associated with it, for it too was a city which lived on its past glories even as early as the second century B.C.E., when the *Μιλησιακά* was written.

From Lycia they cross over to Rhodes, where they take a rest from the voyage. In Rhodes we have more of the sort of stuff that would fit well in the narratives of Petronius and Apuleius, such as Lycinus’ trip to a gallery where three fellows rush up to him offering for a small fee to narrate the mythical fables of the depicted heroes. This is of course the situation that Encolpius finds himself in in the *Satyrica* when he meets Eumolpus while he is admiring mythological paintings in the portico of a Neapolitan temple. Though Lycinus thus rushes through his travelogue and merely hints at a series of stories to which he played audience at different locales throughout the voyage, his mere hinting that there were such tales, without relating them in full to his reader, leaves a clear sense of the elasticity or expandability of the form and the potential for endless elaboration through inserting, or, if you

will, “weaving into” the basic story ever new subordinate narratives, ecphrastic descriptions, speeches, and poetry.

Although the ancient references to the man Aristides have usually been taken to refer to a historical individual, it is consistent with what we have come to know about this genre that the narration was carried by a fictional *persona* by the name of Aristides. The genre in question is of course structurally different from that exemplified by Boccaccio’s *Decamerone*, but closely related to the narrative technique of the *Satyrical* and the *Metamorphoses*. The genre of *Milesia*, or Milesian fiction, should also be differentiated from the first person narrative of Clitophon in Achilles Tatius, which is not a *narratio in personis* to the same extent, since it keeps mostly to a single narrative *persona* and lacks the variety and magnitude of subordinate impersonation. We are attempting here to differentiate between extensive impersonation, which is characteristic of the narrative form of the *Satyrical* and the *Metamorphoses* (the extreme cases being the *Bellum Civile* and *Cupid and Psyche*), and shorter *colloquia personarum* which can be found in most narratives.

The internal definition of the *Metamorphoses* of Apuleius as *Milesia historia* or *fabula* forges a generic succession from the Μιλησιακά of Aristides to the anonymous Μεταμορφώσεις, written in the late first century C.E.,⁴⁹⁸ of which the bare plot is preserved in its Greek epitome, Λούκιος ἢ Ὀνοϋς, found in the Lucianic corpus. A generic succession, of course, should be understood to allow differences between works, without, however, departing from a loosely defined law of the genre. Even more importantly for the study of the *Satyrical*, the classification of the *Metamorphoses* as *Milesia* defines the literary project of Apuleius as the re-enactment of the earlier performance of Sisenna, whose classic Latin version of the Μιλησιακά was perhaps two and a half centuries old at that time—old enough to have inspired other similar projects, of which there is some evidence before Apuleius.

Apuleius is not the first to use the adjective *Milesius* to denote a literary genre, since his younger contemporary Tertullian uses it in the same manner.⁴⁹⁹ In the fifth century, those who write in Latin use this term in two senses, either like Jerome as a direct reference to Sisenna’s text,⁵⁰⁰ or like

⁴⁹⁸ For the dating of the Greek work, see Mason 1994, 1701.

⁴⁹⁹ Tert. *de Anima* 23.4, *historias atque milesias Aeonum* (“the histories and *Milesiae* about their own Aeons [the thirty Aeons, gods, concerning whom the heretic Valentinus invented much]”).

⁵⁰⁰ Jerome *Con. Ruf.* 1.17, *quasi non cirratorum turba Milesiarum in scholis figmenta decantet et testamentum suis Bessorum cachinno membra concutiat atque inter scurrarum epulas*

Martianus Capella and Sidonius Apollinaris as the name of a genre of light entertaining narratives of unspecified length and apparently with no direct reference to Aristides, Sisenna or Apuleius.⁵⁰¹ In this sense, both the plural *Milesiae* and the singular *Milesia* occur. Only in one case is the term associated directly with Apuleius, and in that instance other elements than Apuleius' prior use of it seem to have prompted the association. This reference comes from the highly unreliable collection of the *Scriptores Historiae Augustae*, but the possible historical inaccuracy of the account is not necessarily of importance to our argument. The case in question deals with a younger contemporary, Clodius Albinus, who is said by the author of his biography, "Capitolinus",⁵⁰² to have originated, like Apuleius, from a Punic settlement in Africa, and is further said in one of the two references to his *Milesiae* to have occupied himself with "the Punic Milesian narratives of his countryman Apuleius", *Milesiae Punicae Apulei sui*.⁵⁰³ The mention of this supposed work of Albinus in the context of "Punic" Milesian narratives by Apuleius is tantalizing, when put in context with the recently found papyrus fragment of

nugae istius modi frequententur ("As if the crowd of curly haired boys [from Persius' *Satires* 1.29–30] did not recite the fictions of the *Milesiae* in the schools, and the *Testament and Last Will of the Pig* of the Bessi did not split the sides of the people with loud laughter, and such nonsense were not the common fare at the banquets of buffoons"); *Es.* 12. prae., *Nullus tam imperitus scriptor est, qui lectorem non inveniat similem sui; multo pars maior est Milesias revolventium quam Platonis libros. In altero enim ludus et oblectatio est, in altero difficultas [...] testamentum Grunnii Corocottae porcelli decantant in scholis puerorum agmina cachinnantium* ("No writer is so incompetent that he cannot find a reader similar to himself; many more readers scroll through the *Milesiae* than through the books of Plato. For in the one there is play and delight, while in the other there is difficulty and labor mixed with sweat [...] But in the schools groups of loudly laughing boys recite the *Testament of the Piglet Grunnius Corocotta*").

⁵⁰¹ Mart. Cap. *de Nupt.* 2.100, *nam certe mythos, poeticae etiam diversitatis delicias milesias historiasque mortalium [...] se amissuram [...] formidabat* ("She feared that she would certainly have to forgo mythical fabrications, and even the poetic diversity of delightful Milesian fictions and stories of mortals"); Sid. *Apol. Ep.* 7.2.9, *habetis historiam iuvenis eximii, fabulam Milesiae vel Atticae parem* ("here you have the history of a splendid young man, a fable equal to a Milesian narrative or an Attic play").

⁵⁰² On the problem of authorship and reliability of the *SHA*, see Barnes 1978.

⁵⁰³ *SHA* 12.11.8, *Milesias nonnulli eiusdem [sc. Albinus] esse dicunt, quarum fama non ignobilis habetur quamvis mediocriter scriptae sint* ("Some say that Clodius Albinus wrote Milesian narratives which are considered not entirely inferior despite being only moderately well written"); and *ibid.* 12.12.12, *Maior fuit dolor, quod illum pro litterato laudandum plerique duxistis, cum ille [sc. Albinus] naeniis quibusdam anilibus occupatus inter Milesias Punicas Apulei sui et ludicra litteraria consenesceret* ("It was more painful that most of you held him to be praiseworthy as a man of letters, because he busied himself with certain old wife's tales and grew old among the Punic Milesian fiction of his countryman Apuleius and literary school performances").

Lollianos' sensational and scandalous fiction, the Φοινεικικά (*POxy* 1368), especially when we keep in mind that scholars have observed close parallels between the material of the Lollianos fragment and the episode in the robbers' cave in Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*.⁵⁰⁴ Several scenarios seem possible to connect Albinus, Lollianos, and Apuleius, the most likely one being that Lollianos is indeed the author of the anonymous work adapted by Apuleius, the Μεταμορφώσεις,⁵⁰⁵ as well as the Φοινεικικά, which may then have been adapted by Albinus. This would explain the association of these three authors but there is of course no decisive evidence to prove Lollianos' authorship of the former work, nor Albinus' adaptation of the latter. We can only know for certain that both Greek hypotexts did exist and one of the palimpsests is still extant.

Despite Bürger's success in explaining the nature of the ancient genre called *Milesiae*, he never considered the possibility that the *Satyrica* of Petronius was a direct adaptation of a specific Greek text. Neither was he able to distance himself entirely from the mainstream of German scholarship, claiming that the work of Aristides was "the original paradigm of the realistic novel of manners" (*als erstes Muster des realistischen Sittenromans*). However, instead of relying on national stereotypes to account for ancient realism, he attempts a genuinely literary-historical explanation, based on modern analogy, of the rise of this genre in antiquity: Just as the realistic novel of his times, he says, was influenced by the progress of science, especially in the natural sciences, and manifests a drive towards the concrete and material, in reaction to a past tendency towards abstract philosophical speculation and idealistic poetry, thus similar things must have been taking place in the spiritual life of the empire from ca. 100 B.C.E. to ca. 100 C.E.⁵⁰⁶ Bürger's historical model gives us a fascinating insight into the mostly unstated premises of contemporary attempts to write the "Roman" *Satyrica* into a literary-historical context with the extant Greek erotic novels. Read today, Bürger's description certainly appears to refer not to ancient conditions but modern. In any case, the rejected past has an uncanny resemblance with French eighteenth-century philosophy and idealism, and the embraced future

⁵⁰⁴ Jones 1980, 251–3; Winkler 1980, 158–9.

⁵⁰⁵ Suggested as a possibility by Jones 1980, 254.

⁵⁰⁶ Bürger 1892, 355, *Veranlasst war das Aufkommen einer solchen Literatur ebenso wie die analoge literarische Bewegung in der Gegenwart durch die gegen früher ganz veränderte Geistesrichtung jener Zeit und ihren Zug auf das Concrete und Materielle, wie er uns auch sonst in dem Erlöschen der abstracten philosophischen Speculation und der idealistischen Dichtung und in der gleichzeitigen Blüthe der Wissenschaften, besonders auch der Naturwissenschaften, auf das allerdeutlichste entgegentritt.*

with Prussian science and industrialization. If nothing else, this analogy may at least serve to illustrate the *Zeitgeist* and explain the anxieties that caused the German philologists of the time to experience Petronius' "realistic" novel as modern and progressive, while viewing the Greek as old-fashioned and reactionary.

Bürger then surveys the other examples of the genre of *Milesia*, based on ancient references. Ovid lists, immediately after Aristides, and in the same bibliographical context, a certain Eubius, an *impurae conditor historiae*, who wrote a narrative which was not the manual on abortion that some have thought but a description of the "molestation of mothers' babes" (*qui descripsit corrumpi semina matrum*).⁵⁰⁷ How could abortion serve as erotic entertainment, which is what is demanded by the Ovidian context? But the context certainly allows sex with children, a known topic in pornographic literature, which is moreover repeatedly used by Petronius in the extant *Satyrica*. This writer, Eubius, is according to von Wilamowitz-Möllendorff⁵⁰⁸ identical with the Εὐβίος who is mentioned by Arrian (*Epict.* 4.9.6) also after Aristides and likewise in a bibliographical context as another writer of obscene material. Ovid adds a third anonymous author who "recently composed the *Sybaritica*" (*Trist.* 2.417, *nec qui composuit nuper Sybaritica*), which seems to be the same text as the *Sybaritici libelli* referred to by Martial (12.95,1–2) as the emulated Greek model of a pornographic composition in Latin from the stylus of a certain Mussetius (*Musseti pathicissimos libellos, / Qui certant Sybariticis libellis*).⁵⁰⁹ Finally, today we can add to this list the fragments of Lollianos' Φοινεικτικά (*POxy* 1368), the *Iolaos* narrative (*POxy* 3010) in prosimetrum, and perhaps as well the *Tinouphis* narrative in prosimetrum (*PHaun* inv. 400); the new fragments are all found on second-century C.E. papyri, which does not, however, mean that the texts that they represent are not older but merely gives us an approximate *terminus ante quem* for their dating.⁵¹⁰

⁵⁰⁷ Ov. *Tr.* 2.413f. For this meaning, cf. *Sat.* 113, *puerum corrumperet*; Schol. Iuv. 4.105, *Iuliam in pueritia corruperat*. For *semen* in Ovid in the sense of "child", "offspring", cf. Ov. *Met.* 2.629, 10.470, 15.216, *Fast.* 2.383, *Tr.* 2.415.

⁵⁰⁸ v. Wilamowitz-Möllendorff 1876, 300, writes *Eubius vero ab Eueno in ore Byzantino una tantum litterula distat*. But there are also many variants of the name Eubius in MSS of Ovid.

⁵⁰⁹ We might add to this list Philip of Amphipolis and his work the Ῥοδιακά, which according to the Suda (s.v.) was full nineteen books and "about wholly shameful things". Philip is also listed with Iamblichus and they are said to be writers of charmingly told *amatoriae fabulae* that "stimulate sexually" (Theodor. Prisc. 133.5–12).

⁵¹⁰ The suggestion of Stephens and Winkler 1995, 7 and 363–5, that these Greek compositions may be imitations of the Latin *Satyrica*, besides being a further example of special pleading

Some of these works are little more than titles, but we should remember that the bibliographical context in which they are embedded is what defines their nature and not the title itself. There is no denying the fact that there did exist before Petronius other lascivious erotic prose narratives, which Ovid considered comparable to the *Μιλησιακά* of Aristides. We should also bear in mind that, according to the poet, these works were to be found in Roman libraries early in the first century C.E.⁵¹¹ At that point in time, one of them had certainly been adapted into Latin (Sisenna); in the time of Martial, another work which emulated the *Sybaritica* had been composed in Latin (Mussetius); in the second century Apuleius adapted the *Μεταμορφώσεις*; and shortly afterwards, Clodius Albinus may have occupied himself with “Punic” *Milesiae* in the same style. The cumulative effect of this list, even if we allow for some misunderstanding due to the fragmentary nature of our sources, renders unnecessary the scenario of Petronius, the great Italian inventor. Not only did there exist erotic Greek novels before Petronius, Petronius was not even the first of several (re)writers of *Milesiae* in Latin.

3.2.4 Petronius the Marvel of Literary History

The same year that Bürger published his article on the Greek antecedents of Petronius the Frenchman Albert Collignon published a work of importance for the reception of the *Satyrica*, *Étude sur Pétrone* (1892). Collignon rejected the *hypothèse séduisante* that there existed a genre of licentious Greek romance which Petronius might have imitated. Even the apparently similar Pseudo-Lucianic ass story, he claims, is different, since it is not Menippean in form.⁵¹² In sum, Collignon joins the camp of Mommsen and Rohde and emphasizes the alleged categorical difference of the Greek and Roman novels: “Les romans grecs que nous possédons et le *Satiricon* ne proviennent pas des même sources, et n’ont ni le même objet, ni le même ton”.⁵¹³ He also argues with Rohde that the *Satyrica* is a picaresque novel in subject matter and Menippean satire in form; and he makes of Petronius the inventor of a synthetic but absolutely original genre (*une œuvre absolument originale*), the

in Petronian scholarship, rests on the assumption that the age of the papyri is also close to the definite time of writing of the works.

⁵¹¹ *Trist.* 2.420, *suntque ea doctorum monumentis mixta virorum, / muneribusque ducum publica facta patent* (“These things [e.g. the *Milesiaca* and the *Sybaritica*] are shelved with records of learned men and are open to the public [in libraries] through our leaders’ gifts”).

⁵¹² Collignon 1892, 39.

⁵¹³ Collignon 1892, 38.

Latin novel (*roman Latin*), the only prototype of which is the *Satyrica* itself.⁵¹⁴

If we lay aside for the moment Rohde's (1893) attack on Bürger (dealt with briefly towards the end of this survey), such was the scholarly background into which Richard Heinze (1899) brought his unexpected thesis about the close formal kinship of the extant Greek novels and the *Satyrica*. Heinze attempts at the outset, following Bürger, to sketch the unlikely picture of two completely unrelated ancient novels:

Hier das 'Meisterwerk eines picareschen Romans', das aus dem vollen Leben geschöpfte Zeit- und Sittengemälde, realistisch nach Inhalt und Form, lasciv und frivol bis zur Frechheit; dort die bald feierlich schreitenden, bald zierlich tänzelnden, immer aber raffiniert stilisirten Producte einer Kunstrichtung, die, aller Wirklichkeit abgewandt, blut- und wesenlose Marionetten in einer Phantastischen und sehr moralischen Welt phantastisch sich gebärden lässt.⁵¹⁵

Heinze is the first scholar who seeks to undermine this artificial antithesis by means of a close reading of the *Satyrica* itself. As was discussed in more detail in section 2.1.2 above, by using this method he is able to point out the schematic analogy between the wandering couple, Encolpius and Giton, and the boy-girl heroes of the extant Greek romances. Although Heinze concedes that there are elements of epic parody in the *Satyrica* with respect to the alleged centrality to the plot of Priapus, he rejects Klebs' supposition that the structure is borrowed from epic and claims that a closer parallel can be found in the Greek sentimental novel, wherein such angered deities as Eros and Aphrodite provide the unity to bind together an episodic plot. He finds further resemblances between the *Satyrica*'s divine apparatus and the Greek romances, in the frequent references made by the protagonists to the mostly hostile force of Fortuna or Τύχη, and even in a possible use of a foreshadowing oracle (*Fr.* XXXVII). At the end of his careful comparison, Heinze concludes that for all these similarities to occur in two completely unrelated genres, granting that Rohde was right to derive the *Satyrica* from Menippean satire, or others to derive it from Milesian short stories, would be no less than a "marvel of literary history" (*litterar-historisches Wunder*).⁵¹⁶ For ob-

⁵¹⁴ Collignon 1892, 39.

⁵¹⁵ Heinze 1899, 494.

⁵¹⁶ There is a misreading of Bürger 1889, 356, in the reference to unnamed scholars who derive the genre of Petronius' *Satyrica* from Milesian "short stories". Although Bürger does say that the Greek "realistische Romanliteratur" derives "von dem kleinsten Erzeugnisse der

vious reasons Heinze does not take seriously the anachronistic notion that the *Satyrice* is a picaresque novel.

As was mentioned earlier, Heinze concedes important differences in tone between the *Satyrice* and the extant Greek novels. He claims that whereas the *Satyrice* is comic and farcical, and thus comparable to satyr plays, the Greek novels are “very serious” (*bitter ernst*), and thus comparable to tragedies. Heinze deserves credit for rejecting the attempt to explain the difference between the extant Greek sentimental novels and the *Satyrice* in terms of “Greek” and “Roman” national stereotypes, but it should also be recognized that his marking of this difference in accordance with ancient genres is not a happy one. Although there is clearly a strong comic element in the *Satyrice*, the story is by no means as fantastic and flippant as Greek satyric drama (to judge from what little is extant of that genre), nor does it make much sense to compare the tone of the five extant Greek novels with that of tragedy. The closest analogy among ancient dramatic genres with the tone of these Greek love stories is surely to be found in New Comedy.

Heinze believes that in such scenes as the boys’ encounter with Quartilla, in the battle aboard the ship, and in Encolpius’ skirmish with the holy geese in Croton, battle scenes from the Greek romance are being parodied. Likewise, according to him, the slapstick incident where the boys use a blunt razor to cut their throats parodies the “apparent death” device of the Greek romance. The allusions to epic and tragedy in the *Satyrice* also serve the same parodic purpose. Accordingly, Encolpius’ address to his own *mentula* is a parody of the heroic dialogue of Odysseus with his heart; and the boy’s fancy that he is persecuted by Priapus, says Heinze, is merely a comic send-up of the struggle of epic heroes against grander deities. It weakens Heinze’s parody thesis that he argues that the *Satyrice* is a parody not only of the Greek novel but also of many other genres. If the work is a parody of epic and tragedy, as well as the Greek novel, this would certainly indicate that we are dealing not with a parody of anything in particular, but a text written in a parodic style without targeting a particular work or genus of works. Why insist on a parody of the Greek novel, when we could just as well have chosen epic or tragedy from the list of parodied genres?

In order for the *Satyrice* to contain parody of the Greek novel, the genre had to be older than the Second Sophistic; indeed, it had to be older than Petronius. Heinze’s comparative reading showed how both the *Satyrice* and the extant Greek novels conform to some extent with the first century B.C.E. rhetorical description of non-judicial narrative. In that sense, he did show

erzählenden Prosadichtung, den Novellen”, it is precisely his point that “Milesian tales” are not simply *Novellen*.

that Rohde was wrong to think that Antonius Diogenes was an early (first century C.E.) and not fully developed specimen of the genre. Heinze did not take the Ninos fragments, A and B, which had been published six years earlier,⁵¹⁷ to provide a full refutation of Rohde's thesis, because of the difficulty of their dating. He does, however, use these fragments to support his thesis that rhetorical elements in Petronius (which he also finds in the Ninos fragments) show that the late flourishing of rhetoric in the Second Sophistic should not, as Rohde had maintained, be viewed as a necessary prerequisite for the development of the narrative technique and style of the Greek erotic novel. Although he praises Rohde for his demonstration of the influence of the rhetoric of the Second Sophistic on the Greek erotic romance, Heinze nevertheless stresses that earlier specimens of the genre contain just as much rhetoric, but perhaps of an earlier and somewhat different brand. In one part of his article he tries to show both the similarities and the differences of various rhetorical schemes found in Petronius and the sophistic novel, and concludes with the remarkable formulation that the main difference lies in Petronius' keeping his admirably artless prose separate from his poetry, while the sophists wrote prose that was "contaminated" with poetic artificiality.

Following such stylistic observations he asks whether the writers of "serious" Greek novels also wrote in the manner of Petronius. The question, he says, constitutes "the hardest literary-historical problem raised by the *Satyrical*" (*das schwerste litterarhistorische Problem, das uns die Saturae aufgeben*). And how did Petronius get the idea to dress his comic romance, which he presumably wrote following someone else, in the form of a Menippean satire? The answer he gives is disappointing, and not in tune with his main argument. Petronius, he claims, was the first "to turn the novel into a satire" (*Petron, wie ich annehme, der erste war, der den Roman zur Saturamachte*). However, although he acknowledges that he cannot prove that there already existed before Petronius a parody of the Greek erotic novel, he finds it very hard to believe that the same author who invented this original mixture was also the first to parody the Greek erotic novel; or, as he incredulously puts it, "two such important innovations are usually not introduced at the same time by the same individual" (*zwei so erhebliche Neuerungen pflegen nicht zu gleicher Zeit von demselben eingeführt zu werden*). Heinze's article ends on the by now conventional tone of appraisal of Petronius' genius (*einen Geist wie Petron*) for the modern virtue of realism.

⁵¹⁷ Wilcken 1893, 161–93.

Last in this survey of the founders of modern Petronian scholarship comes Martin Rosenblüth with his inaugural dissertation, *Beiträge zur Quellenkunde von Petrons Satiren* (1902). Rosenblüth, who was a student of von Wilamowitz-Möllendorff in Berlin and of Felix Jacoby in Kiel, shows little interest in epic unity or novelistic structures, but, like the ancient grammarian, culls the *Satyrica* for interesting pieces (*Stücken*) and compares these to similarly hand-picked pieces from other literary genres (*der bescheidene Zweck meiner Arbeit ist vielmehr, durch Zusammenstellung einzelner Partien von Petrons Werk mit vergleichbaren Stücken aus anderen Literaturgattungen einen Beitrag zur Quellenkunde der Satiren zu geben*).⁵¹⁸ Along with Collignon, Rosenblüth is certainly the father of the “synthetic” reading of the *Satyrica*, which is a necessary consequence of a radical claim to originality for Petronius.

By the time of Rosenblüth the image of Petronius as the original Italic or Italian genius and artist had become so entrenched that Heinze’s theory of Petronius’ reliance on a Greek parodic novel could be understood by him as an attempt to “rob the Roman ... of any originality” (*beraubt den Römer ... jeder originalität*).⁵¹⁹ The aim of Rosenblüth’s study is to show that Petronius was not following any single preexisting genre when he wrote the *Satyrica*. The argumentative strategy is to portray the plot of the work as radically episodic and to emphasize the poor condition of the text as an obstacle to any coherent thesis about the original shape of the whole—all such theses naturally tending towards undermining Petronius’ originality—without offering any new suggestions about the larger aspect of the full-text *Satyrica* (*Doch ich will mich auf eine polemische Auseinander-setzung mit Heinzes Ansicht nicht einlassen, will auch keine positive neue Erklärung des literarischen Rätsels, das die Satiren bieten, an ihre Stelle setzen*).⁵²⁰ To Rosenblüth belongs also the invention of a common preamble of many modern studies of Petronius—the one which begins by listing all the (failed) theses about the genre of the *Satyrica* without committing itself to any one of them, or offering alternatives, thereby obscuring the literary-historical context of the work and giving the author an aura of mystery and genius.

Though Rosenblüth’s position may appear to be only motivated by a painstaking concern for establishing the truth of the matter, he throws caution to the wind when he subscribes to the anachronistic paradigm of the

⁵¹⁸ Rosenblüth 1909, 6.

⁵¹⁹ Rosenblüth 1909, 92; von Wilamowitz-Möllendorff 1905, 124f., expresses the same anxiety about the possibility of scholarship reducing Petronius’ reputation for “originality”: “dem Dichter soll wahrlich seine Originalität nicht verkleinert werden.”

⁵²⁰ Rosenblüth 1909, 6.

realistische Sittenroman, the realistic novel of manners, so popular with the previous generation of German philologists. It is “the one thing that is beyond doubt”, in his opinion, that Petronius’ writerly intention was to create such a work and Rosenblüth reminds himself that it is “good always to keep this in mind” (*An einem ist nicht zu zweifeln: Petrons schriftstellerische Absicht war die Darstellung der Sitten seiner Zeit, und zwar ohne jede moralische Tendenz. Es ist gut, das für die folgende Untersuchung immer im Auge zu behalten*).⁵²¹ Rosenblüth clearly adheres to the scholarly consensus that the *Satyrica* is a realistic novel written in the Menippean form, but his original contribution consists of the claim that this already composite work is also filled with the “spirit of mime”.⁵²² Furthermore, without giving reasons for his belief, Rosenblüth is in no doubt that the *Satyrica* forms a genre with the *Metamorphoses* of Apuleius (*beide Werke gehören in eine Kategorie, die wir als den realistisch-komischen Abenteuerroman bezeichnen können*).⁵²³ Rosenblüth seems blind to the literary-historical implications of assigning the *Satyrica* of Petronius to the same genre as the Roman adaptation of the Greek Ass-Story. For if the *Satyrica* is of the same genre as the *Metamorphoses*, it follows that the *Satyrica* is also of the same genre as its Greek model. If Petronius was the inventor of the comic novel, we must therefore assume that the author of the Greek Ass-Story was imitating the *Satyrica* (or some intermediate source), which would establish the necessary generic link from the earlier *Satyrica* to the later Μεταμορφώσεις. This supposition is unfounded and contradicts Apuleius’ classification of the genre of the *Metamorphoses* as *Milesia*, i.e. as ultimately deriving from the much earlier Μιλησιακά of Aristides. Therefore, assigning the *Satyrica* and the *Metamorphoses* of Apuleius to the same genre—*per se* a sound critical judgment—means that Petronius did not invent the genre.

Rosenblüth spends a full five pages towards the end of his dissertation in an attempt to refute Bürger’s (1892) thesis, but only succeeds in refuting its weakest assumption, i.e., that there was a “realistic” novel before Petronius. In general he relies on Rohde, who had quickly responded to Bürger’s arguments *cum ira et studio*.⁵²⁴ It is Rohde’s observation that nothing in the words of the rhetorical treatises referred to by Bürger proves the existence of

⁵²¹ Rosenblüth 1909, 9.

⁵²² Rosenblüth can be said to have laid the foundation of the current scholarly discourse which interprets the *Satyrica* as the “narrative equivalent” of a play on stage (Walsh 1974, Slater 1990, and Panayotakis 1995), or at least sees mime as a major source of influence on its style and composition (Sandy 1974b).

⁵²³ Rosenblüth 1909, 93.

⁵²⁴ Rohde 1893, 125–139.

a “realistic” method of writing (*in diesen Worten nichts liegt, was auf eine “realistische” Dichtungsweise schließen ließe*), which convinces Rosenblüth who fully concedes the possibility of earlier Greek *Liebesromane*.

Moreover, Rohde’s concepts of the “novel” (a psychological character-study of epic dimensions) and the “short story” (a concise treatment of a dramatic situation) were highly modern. It is on the basis of such modern concepts that he excluded categorically that the ancient Greeks ever had a “bourgeois novel”, since such a novel could not possibly develop from “short stories”, due to the precisely defined nature of the latter.⁵²⁵ Although Bürger claimed that the *Milesia* had developed from *Novellen*, his understanding was also that there was no essential difference between shorter and longer ancient *narrationes*, which therefore allowed shorter ones to be expanded and longer ones to be abbreviated. As we have seen, the narrative form of *Milesia* is an elastic one, it can expand and contract through the inclusion or omission of the narrator’s subordinate narratives, speeches or poetry in the person of another. In Bürger’s understanding the ancient *Milesia(e)* were an elaborate fabric of many *fabulae* woven together into a whole around the central adventure of the narrator.⁵²⁶

Rohde had claimed in his monumental study of the Greek romance that there was no point in denying that story-telling on a smaller scale and the ancient Greek novel were related and while describing Longus’ *Daphnis and Chloe* he had argued that this novel was composed of a series of idyllic scenes woven together into a whole by means of an erotic fable.⁵²⁷ The rules changed, however, when the discussion turned to the seemingly modern “realistic novel” and “realistic short story” of antiquity, despite the rather obvious relationship of the *Satyrical* and the *Metamorphoses* with shorter, subordinate narratives of a similar nature to the main fables. Finally, Rohde adopted the position that the *Μιλησιακά* of Aristides was “eine Reihe selbständig in sich abgeschlossener Erzählungen, die wir Novellen nennen würden, nur lose verbunden neben einander.”⁵²⁸

The question that Rohde and Bürger were debating concerned how tightly or loosely Aristides wove together the diverse narratives of the *Μιλησιακά*. The answer to this question in turn determined whether the work should rather be called a series of inter-connected shorter narratives, or a

⁵²⁵ Rohde 1893, 135, “von der Novelle war eine organische Erweiterung zum bürgerlichen Roman nicht zu erwarten, da ein solches Wachstum, wie es scheint, durch die genau umgrenzte Natur der Novellendichtung überhaupt ausgeschlossen ist.”

⁵²⁶ Bürger 1902, 20 f.

⁵²⁷ Rohde 1876, 7, 510.

⁵²⁸ Rohde 1893, 127.

loosely composed novel, in the style of the *Satyrica* and the *Metamorphoses*, with shorter subordinate narratives interwoven into a central main narrative.⁵²⁹ Rosenblüth rightly finds unacceptable the solution offered by Hans Lucas who argued that the work of Aristides was neither a *Roman* nor a simple collection of short stories, but a collection of novellas worked into a *Rahmenerzählung*.⁵³⁰ Rosenblüth's influential conclusion that the work was simply a "sammlung erotischer Novellen", perhaps with a "prooimion", *also etwas anderes, als es Petrons Satiren sind* (90), is both contrary to the evidence that the narratives of Aristides were interwoven as opposed to distinct and contradicts his own reading of Lucian and Ovid, according to which Aristides (or his narrator) played audience to other narrators,⁵³¹ in the manner of both Petronius' Encolpius and Apuleius' Lucius. Rosenblüth wraps up his dissertation by stating that since we cannot ascertain that there existed a "realistic" novel before Petronius it is safest to assume that he created it, though he is careful to allow the possibility that the sands of Egypt may change that situation (*Diese Frage ist mit Sicherheit nicht zu entscheiden. Für uns ist Petron jedenfals der erste auf diesem Gebiete und wird es bleiben, falls der Boden Ägyptens uns nicht auch hier Überraschungen bereitet*).⁵³²

We conclude our survey by reiterating that for good and ill today's Petronian scholars are still sitting on the shoulders of German philologists of roughly a century ago. Moreover, because attempts to introduce into the study of the *Satyrica* modern ideological and esthetic criteria from the study of national literatures were not successfully challenged by scholars working in the field, we are still laboring under presuppositions which tend to exaggerate the differences and minimize the similarities of the *Satyrica* to ancient Greek fiction at large. It seems that those German scholars who found little of interest for the subject in the exclusive analytical rigor of nationalism, and saw Greco-Roman literary history more in terms of a continuum and a dialogue between Greek and Latin texts, were mostly ignored by subsequent generations.⁵³³ This was unfortunate because the best arguments still incline

⁵²⁹ See Winkler's 1985, 165, insightful analysis of the tension between unity and diversity in Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*.

⁵³⁰ Lucas 1907, 16ff

⁵³¹ Rosenblüth 1909, 90. n.1, "aus den Anfangsworten des Apuleius und aus Lucian geht hervor, daß das Charakteristische an den Milesiaca die *variae fabulae* waren; aus den beiden Ovidstellen und Lucian, daß sie ἀκόλαστα διηγήματα, erotischer natur waren; aus Lucian weiter, daß Aristides sie sich erzählen ließ (ich glaube, daß dies auch der sinn der dunklen Ovidstelle: *iunxit Aristides Milesia crimina secum* ist.)."

⁵³² Rosenblüth 1909, 91.

⁵³³ This view is perhaps changing in a limited fashion with a new generation of scholars as is

towards the case of a Greek genre adapted by Roman authors; but perhaps most compelling, the verdict of the sands of Egypt, to which both parties to the quarrel had the wisdom to appeal, has been unanimously in favor of Bürger and Heinze and against Mommsen, Rohde and Rosenblüth.⁵³⁴

3.2.5 The Logic of the Palimpsest⁵³⁵

It is perhaps a measure of Mommsen's (1878) authority that later scholars have not questioned his attempt to account for the linguistic and cultural mixture of the *Satyrica* as Petronius' direct and faithful representation of life in Campania. What gave Mommsen such influence over subsequent generations of classicists was most likely his acknowledged mastery of the material remains of Roman culture, especially through his extensive study of Latin inscriptions as the editor of the *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*.

In order to identify the city of Trimalchio, he first develops a complex argument regarding the cultural background of the *Satyrica*. As is still visible to the eye in the ruins of Pompeii, he argues, this epoch in Roman history is so thoroughly permeated with Hellenic elements that a purely Latin rural town, such as those presented in the *togata* of the late Republic, which surely existed in isolated places, could only serve as a comic antithesis (*nur etwa noch als komisches Gegenstück zu verwenden im Stande war*) to a depicter of manners and a satirist (*der Sittenmaler und Satiriker*) such as the literary artist Petronius. Nowhere in Italy, Mommsen continues, was Greek culture stronger than in the Hellenic settlements of the West, which preserved their origin from a Greek stock, although they were by necessity Latinized to a

indicated e.g. by the fact that Niklas Holzberg 1995 now follows Heinze completely in his introductory study and describes the *Satyrica* throughout in terms of "realism" and parody of the idealistic Greek romance. He further takes the *Iolaos* fragment as an indication that "there really was a Greek tradition of comic realistic narrative combining prose with verse. And it seems reasonable to assume that this tradition was older than Petronius' *Satyrica*" (63).

⁵³⁴ Rosenblüth's appeal to the sands of Egypt echoes Bürger's 1903, 28, final words: "Es wäre zu wünschen, daß der Boden Ägyptens, der unsere Kenntnis des idealistischen Romans im Altertume in den letzten Jahren so bedeutend bereichert und uns darüber ganz neue Anschauungen gebracht hat, auch für diesen seinen realistischen Vetter sich einmal fruchtbar erwiese."

⁵³⁵ I use the term "palimpsest" as defined by Gérard Genette in his *Palimpsests: Literature in the Second Degree*, i.e. as a broad term to denote a text derived from a previous text through transformation or imitation. It covers translation, copy, make-over, adaptation and many other such terms. I also occasionally use the word "hypotext" which is Genette's term for the model or source text.

degree through their environment, carrying within them the seeds of the prevailing double culture from the very beginning (*welche ihrem Ursprung nach einen Stamm griechischen Wesens bewahrend und durch ihre Umgebung zugleich nothwendig bis zu einem gewissen Grade latinisirt die herrschende Doppelbildung gleichsam von Haus aus in sich trugen*). The Greek language of these Westerners may have appeared as a provincial idiom to the Athenian, he says, but in an epoch when the Hellenic nationality resided predominantly in the diaspora (*das hellenische Wesen überwiegend auf der Diaspora ruhte*), the Greek of Campania will not have been inferior to the Greek of Antioch and Alexandria, and in comparison to the educated man from Patavium, Lugudunum, Corduba, and Carthago, he was still always a native Greek, whose mother tongue was at the same time the universal language of the times. According to Mommsen, at least in Naples the official language of the city's government remained demonstrably Greek until the times of Domitian and likely much longer. The Greek schools, the Greek games, the united tribes of Greek artists and men of learning, he says, turned this city into an island of Hellenic culture in Italy, which lasted until the breakdown of Italic prosperity and education (*den Zusammenbruch des italischen Wohlstandes und der italischen Bildung*). Therefore, Mommsen argues in a stupendous anticlimax, the city of Trimalchio cannot be Naples, although Naples would be the most obvious *urbs Graeca* in Campania, since, in the Greek city of the *Satyrice*, everyone speaks Latin, even the town crier (*Sat.* 97.2).

Mommsen, to his credit, realized that in a faithful description of contemporary life Greek characters moving in a Greek environment should neither speak Latin perfectly like educated Romans, nor quote Roman authors off the top of their heads.⁵³⁶ To work around this fact within the constraints he had created he identified the city of Trimalchio as Cumae, a Latin speaking city that was founded in the legendary period of Greek colonization. However, Mommsen conveniently omitted significant facts about Cumae, viz. that it had already lost its Greek identity in the late fifth century B.C.E. when it was sacked and repopulated by Oscan tribes (D.S. 11.51, 12.76), its former Greek citizens allegedly fleeing to found the city of Naples, until it eventually took up the Latin language early in the second century B.C.E., later to

⁵³⁶ The following is the complete list of Greek and Roman authors in the *Satyrice*: Demosthenes (2.5), Homer (2.4, 48.7, 59.3, 118.5), Euripides (2.3), Hyperides (2.8), the nine lyric poets (2.4, 118.5), Pindar (2.4), Plato (2.5), Sophocles (2.3), Thucydides (2.8), Democritus (88.3), Eudoxus (88.4), Chrysippus (88.4), Epicurus (104.3, 132.15 v. 7), Cicero (3.2, 5 v. 20, 55.5), Lucilius (4.5), Publilius Syrus (55.5), Horace (118.5), Virgil (68.5, 118.5), Cato (137.9 v. 6), Servius Sulpicius Rufus (137.9 v. 8) and Antistius Labeo.

become legally a Roman colony. Besides, in the unlikely event that Cumae could still be considered a “Greek” city in the first century C.E. Mommsen’s suggested solution does not begin to explain why Encolpius, Giton, Ascyltos, Eumolpus, Tryphaena, Lichas and the other Greek characters who neither originate from nor permanently reside in the *urbs Graeca* are still fluent speakers of Latin, expressing themselves as if they were educated Roman citizens of high social standing.

Later scholars tend either to brush off the anomaly or fail to notice it at all. In his seminal study of the ‘Roman novel’, Walsh describes the *Satyricon* as taking its reader on:

what purports to be a conducted tour of the Greek city-life of Gaul and Italy, but which is essentially a review of the Roman contemporary scene. Though the hero and his friends are Greeks, their attitudes and preoccupations are wholly Roman. The inconsistency did not trouble Petronius, whose aim was ephemeral entertainment, not a closely articulated work of art; and *the Romanising of the characters and situations lends the novel a greater immediacy and realism* [my italics].⁵³⁷

Unlike Mommsen, Walsh does not think that Petronius’ use of a Greek narrator, characters and cities for his “Roman novel” calls for an explanation. He merely leaves his readers with a rhetorical antithesis between what “purports” and what “is essentially”, which begs the question why Petronius should have taken it upon himself to write a Greek story to convey “a review of the Roman contemporary scene.” Walsh’s idea that the very “inconsistency” and artificiality of the “Romanising” of this Greek story could both be entertaining and result in “immediacy and realism” clearly recalls Mommsen’s topsy-turvy logic.

Another influential scholar who has touched upon the question, Gareth Schmeling, likewise notes in a study on the personal names in Petronius that:

Greek names so pervade and dominate the *Satyricon* that the whole atmosphere becomes Greek [...] Instead of populating his novel with Greek freedmen, former slaves, and present slaves, Petronius could have used Roman characters. He chose not to. The only literary genre in earlier Roman history to use such a large number of Greek characters was comedy. The Greek style of comedy was called *fabula palliata*, a term derived from *pallium*, a Greek cloak.⁵³⁸

⁵³⁷ Walsh 1970, 79.

⁵³⁸ Schmeling 1969b, 5.

Although Schmeling does not say so, the Greek names in the comedies of Plautus and Terence were taken directly from the Greek plays that they were adapting into Latin or made up in order to fit their Greek context. The likely conclusion, therefore, that could be drawn from the similarity of the use of names in the *Satyrice* and Roman comedy is that the former is also a Roman adaptation of a Greek text. The point, however, is missed by Schmeling who claims that Plautus and Terence used Greek names in their plays in order “that they might escape the charge of ridiculing and demeaning their own race.” Schmeling goes on to argue, on the basis of this unfounded Roman chauvinism in authors who were not even true-blooded Romans, that “to the Roman audience the use of such a high proportion (77%) of Greek names in a work of literature written by a Roman could mean only one thing: comedy.”⁵³⁹ Schmeling’s conclusion is untenable, of course, since Greek names in Latin tragedies, e.g. the republican tragedians’ adaptations of Greek tragic works or Ovid’s *Medea* or Seneca’s Greek tragedies, were certainly no indication of comedy to their Roman audience.

Anyone who wishes to use the names of characters in the *Satyrice* as an argument for or against a thesis about its composition must also explain the numerous Greek case endings of the names, which coexist in the text with corresponding Latin case endings, so that the same Greek name may be spelled at times in the Greek manner and at times in the Roman. Thus we find the Latinized nominative Encolpius two times (20.7, 94.3), but the Greek accusative ending in Encolpion five times (92.7, 104.1, 109.3, 114.9, 128.7); the Greek accusative Gitona over twenty times, but the Latin Gitonem twice (98.2, 129.8); we also find the Greek Eumolpos (102.3, 107.12, 109.1, 110.6, 124.2) and Eumolpon (95.9, 96.6, 102.2) eight times besides the thirty-eight Latin Eumolpus (92.2, 92.5, 94.7, 94.8, 94.15, 95.4, 95.6, 97.1, 98.2, 98.5, 99.4, 99.6, 101.3, 101.9, 102.13, 103.1, 103.4, 104.3, 105.2, 108.3, 109.8, 113.12, 113.13, 115.20, 117.1, 117.4, 117.5, 118.1, 125.1, 132.6, 140.5, 140.9, 140.11) and Eumolpum (90.1, 95.7, 115.2, 124.3, 140.2); and we find the Greek forms Niceros (61.3) and Nicerotem (61.1) beside the Latin Niceronem (63.1). This inconsistency in the spelling of Greek names in the *Satyrice* needs to be explained, and I don’t mean explained away with propositions to “correct” all the variant spellings.⁵⁴⁰ If the

⁵³⁹ Schmeling 1969b, 6.

⁵⁴⁰ As is done by Kershaw 1981 who wishes to rationalize the text (“There is no reason for mixed forms in the narrative sections”) and, if I have not misunderstood his note, proposes no less than ten changes in the text to get rid of the inconsistency, most of which are simply justified with “scribes’ confusion”. Kershaw’s initial point that “[T]o the urbane Encolpius the accusative of Niceros is Nicerotem (61.1), to the vulgar Trimalchio it is Niceronem

Latin text of the *Satyrica* is a palimpsest, this textual inconsistency is easily accounted for as inconsistent Latinizing, but if it were an original composition it would be something of a mystery how these forms came about.

We obviously need to understand better the logic of the linguistic and cultural mixture in the *Satyrica*. Let us, for the sake of argument, grant the premise that Petronius' aim was a realistic portrayal of his times. The main character and narrator is a Greek exile from Massalia, who was brought up and educated in the Greek language, but who in the extant part of the work, while a luckless youth wandering in the Greek cities of southern Italy, is represented as fluent in Latin and possessing a mature knowledge of such Roman authors as Cicero, Lucilius, Virgil, Livy and Horace. The native language of Massalia in the early empire was certainly Greek.⁵⁴¹ The Massaliot rhetor Agroitias, whom the Elder Seneca describes as having spoken *arte inculta* ("without learning") on a certain *controversia* in order to resemble a Roman, even so utters his *sententia* in Greek (Sen. *Con.* 2.6.12). As a rule, Greek rhetors declaimed in Greek and Roman rhetors in Latin—and possibly Greek, if they had the perfect knowledge of the language that rhetorical exercises demanded. Even if Encolpius is supposed to be a highly atypical Greek who learned Latin as an adult, as for example Dionysius of Halicarnassus claimed to have done,⁵⁴² which would have made it possible for him to tell his story in Latin, the narrator's representation of his own youthful self remains problematic. Fresh from Greek-speaking Massalia it is impossible to believe that he would have been so sensitive to the correct pronunciation of Latin that an imperfect recital of Vergilian verses should offend him (*Sat.* 68.5).

In the declamation in Latin which opens the extant text of the *Satyrica*, this well-trained Greek youth begins by expressing his disgust with bombastic rhetorical exercises, which he describes as filled with fabulous plots and sound-effects, and far removed from the realities of the typically Roman courts in the *forum* (1.2); he then proceeds to evoke a whole gallery of

(63.1)" only works after he has removed the inconsistency in Encolpius' usage elsewhere. Segebade and Lommatzsch 1962 wisely accept the inconsistency.

⁵⁴¹ According to Varro three languages were spoken in Massalia, Greek, Latin and Gallic (Isid. *Etym.* 15.1.63, *Trilingues, quod et graece loquuntur et latine et gallice*). But the Gallic language was not written, although undoubtedly spoken by slaves and traders, and Latin was only spoken by the Romans residing in Massalia, at least until the second century, for Latin inscriptions in Massalia are written out in Greek characters (*CIL* 12.56), and Roman names first begin to appear towards the end of the second century, when Massalia at last became a city under Roman administration; see Clerc 1971, 1:460.

⁵⁴² After he settled in Rome where he lived for twenty-two years, as he explains in the introduction to *Roman Antiquities*.

Greek-only literary worthies (Sophocles, Euripides, Pindar, the lyric poets, Homer, Plato, Demosthenes, Thucydides, Hyperides), who according to him never had to undergo such useless schooling and yet became masters of artistic discourse; and he ends by blaming the decline of oratory on a “windy and enormous loquacity that has recently migrated to Athens from Asia” (2.7, *nuper ventosa istaec et enormis loquacitas Athenas ex Asia commigravit*), referring to the notorious bogeyman of the “Asiatic” style, or “Asianism”. While it seemed at first that we were mentally situated in the vicinity of the law courts of a Roman *forum*, the bulk of young Encolpius’ “declamation” shows no further awareness of things Roman, but upholds what can only be described as an Attic point of view, to the extent of having led scholars to suspect that young Encolpius’ language and opinions are “owed to a Greek source.”⁵⁴³

This strange mixture of “Roman” and “Greek” is even more confusing in the subsequent Lucilian metrical rendering, improvised by the Greek Agamemnon, on the important subject of the proper schooling for boys. The highly circumlocutory hexameter part of this “poem” could be summarized in the following way: Whether Athenian, Spartan or Neapolitan (*sirenumve domus*), the boy should begin with Homer, and soon after study Plato and Demosthenes; but then he should switch languages and become immersed in Roman authors and be “relieved of the burden of Greek sounds” (*Sat.* 5.15–16, *Graio / exonerata sono*),⁵⁴⁴ and when he is thoroughly steeped in Latin literature his taste will change, and he can employ Cicero as model for the composition of epic poetry.

An educational programme like this one never existed anywhere in Greco-Roman antiquity. Firstly, there is discrepancy between form and content. Why does Lucilian, and therefore “Roman” satire, deal with the education of Greek schoolboys from Athens, Sparta and Naples? Secondly, the bilingual nature of the curriculum does not square with what we know of the education of Greek boys. Thirdly, it is absurd that the Greek schoolboy would perceive the switch from his own language, Greek, to a foreign language, Latin, as the lifting of a burden. It is true that certain elements here could fit the education of Roman schoolboys, who traditionally began with Greek (the Romans took over wholesale the Greek educational system) before they moved on to works written in Latin. At that point in his education,

⁵⁴³ See Sinclair (1984), 234, who surveys the older scholarship as well.

⁵⁴⁴ There is another language switcher in the poetic *Fr.* XXXI. According to Bücheler, Dousa suggested the speaker was a parrot, but even so this parrot would be modeled on the typical *advena* (“resident foreigner”) in Rome. For *sonum* in the sense of ‘the sound of the spoken language’ see also *Ov. Fast.* 5.195, *Corrupta sono Latino littera Graeca*.

the Roman boy might well be relieved to switch from a foreign language, Greek, to his mother tongue, Latin.⁵⁴⁵ But the poem does not deal with the education of Roman boys.

Agamemnon's school programme is said to be for Greek boys, but it is really only possible for Roman boys, and yet Agamemnon is himself Greek (he does not have a Roman *praenomen* any more than most of the characters), and he lectures in a Greek city (*urbs Graeca*), where Greek schoolboys would be the norm. Even if we assume, contrary to appearances, that Agamemnon is a thoroughly Romanized Greek, this highly atypical linguistic condition—improvising poetry in Latin was not an easy feat, even for native speakers—still clashes with the fact that he intends his curriculum for Greek boys.⁵⁴⁶ The truth is, that however we turn this poem on its head we can never show that anything of the kind could ever have been composed by any real individual in any real ancient Campanian city. The poem and its setting are simply not, as Mommsen argued, a realistic representation of the cultural mix of southern Italy in the first century.

However, if we assume that Petronius recomposed in Latin a preexisting Greek poem on the same topic and shaped it in the form of a Lucilian satire, adding a Roman layer on top of the Greek foundation, this process could well have produced this poem. The underlying Greek hypotext and context would have presented Agamemnon trying to impress Encolpius by improvising in Greek on the topic of how Greek boys had to be raised on the ancient musical diet of Homer (epic), Plato (philosophy), and Demosthenes (rhetoric), so that they could later imitate these canonical authors in their own literary productions. When Petronius reached this poem in his Greek model, in order to rewrite it as Lucilian satire, he first had to make changes in the meter. Imitating the most famous contemporary writer of satires in Latin, A. Persius Flaccus (34–62 C.E.), who imitated the meters of Lucilius in the prologue of his works, the Greek rhetor Agamemnon now breaks into Latin scazons, or limping iambics, and then switches abruptly to hexameters. Towards the end of Petronius' Latin recomposition, then, the switch of languages is reflected in the boys' curriculum and Cicero is added to their reading, regardless of their being as Greek as their teacher.

⁵⁴⁵ The education of Echion's son follows the same Roman pattern: 46.5, "*ceterum iam graeculis [sc. litteris] calcem impingit et Latinas [sc. litteras] coepit non male appetere*" ("Now that he's giving those little Greek [letters] the boot, he's begun to make a decent start on Latin letters").

⁵⁴⁶ The real linguistic constitution of such men was more like that of Lucian's humiliated Greek scholar in the household of a wealthy Roman *pater familias* who 'barbarizes the Roman language' (Lucian *Merc. Cond.* 24, τὴν Ῥωμαίων φωνὴν βαρβαρίζων).

If I have rightly described how Petronius (re)wrote this poem of the *Satyrice*, then this part at least of his Greek hypotext was just as prosimetric as its Latin adaptation. The unavoidable implication is that the Greek model of the central *fabula* of the Massaliot Encolpius was prosimetric as a whole. We need not doubt that other sections of the work, such as the shorter *fabulae* of Eumolpus, both of which are set in Asia Minor, Pergamum and Ephesus, had Greek models. It is harder to determine, however, whether the long poems attributed to the poet had any counterparts in the Greek model or were just added by Petronius, since the traditional method of Roman adaptation could include completely new material, or material which came from other works, either Greek or Latin, by so-called “contamination”.

One amusing side-effect of this thesis is that it seems that we can now finally put to rest the long-standing debate about the identity of the city of Trimalchio. In tune with the characteristic layering in the *Satyrice* of Roman elements on top of Greek foundations, it becomes a possibility that the “Greek city” / “Roman colony” never really existed in ancient Campania, but was created by Petronius through the transformation of the Greek hypotext. Which would explain why, despite the fairly detailed description of the place, it has still been impossible to determine its identity to everyone’s satisfaction. Neither the extensive archeological research in the area, nor the great amount of scholarly ink spilt over the problem since Mommsen, has changed much in this respect. The real reason for this state of things is the frustrating inconsistency of the information provided by the text of *Satyrice*. On the one hand, the place is a “Greek city” with the presence of Greek scholars and a Greek cultural environment (therefore Neapolis), and on the other, the language spoken there is Latin, and it seems that we are dealing with a Roman colony with Roman institutions and magistrates (therefore Puteoli, or even Cumae). Neither Mommsen’s claim that Cumae was properly an *urbs Graeca*, nor Rose’s contention that the term *urbs Graeca* (*Sat.* 81.3) is mere mockery of the place—in the manner of Juvenal calling Rome itself a Greek city⁵⁴⁷—solves the problem. The term *urbs Graeca* issues from the mouth of a native Greek and is not intended as mockery of a quintessentially Roman place, but instead refers to a city which shows many signs of being indeed Greek.

The lack of cultural and linguistic realism which we have been observing in the *Satyrice* has been studied by Gordon Williams in other works of Roman literature that are known to be palimpsests. In a truly insightful chapter, “The blending of Greek and Roman”, Williams explains how Roman authors

⁵⁴⁷ Rose (1962), 404; Juv. 3.60–61, *non possum ferre, Quirites, / Graecam urbem* (“I cannot, fellow Romans, endure this Greek city”).

acted as if the transition from Greek to Roman literature was a natural continuation of the same tradition: “Roman poets treated both earlier Roman poets and Greek poets in the same way that Greek poets had themselves treated their own predecessors.”⁵⁴⁸ In fact, a Roman adaptation is neither a translation, which presupposes that one language can function as the unproblematic parallel of another, nor a complete reworking, which transforms cultural settings and forces them to comply with the new environment. Instead, Roman adaptations blend Greek and Roman elements in such an undifferentiated manner that attempting to distinguish them almost amounts to tearing apart the work itself. However, if we nevertheless care to do such violence to these compositions, the works turn out to be basically Greek, but on top of the Greek base is added a Roman linguistic and cultural layer, which assures that the final outcome is, strictly speaking, a utopian creation, if we apply to it the criterion of realism. These symptoms are obvious in those works which we know to be direct Roman adaptations from Greek literature, such as the works Williams makes the objects of his study, the comedies of Plautus, Virgil’s *Eclogues*, and Horace’s *Odes*.

Perhaps the hardest thing to accept in this new reading of the *Satyrica* is the idea that the “vulgar” Latin of the freedmen, some of whom are originally of Greco-Asian background, does not represent a realistic imitation of how such characters would actually have spoken Latin. In an interesting twist of the palimpsest, the partially Romanized Greeks of the *Satyrica* who have had occasion and opportunity to learn Latin, such former Roman slaves as Gaius Trimalchio and his friends, speak an inferior Latin compared with the genuine Greeks who have had no time or opportunity to learn Latin, such characters as Encolpius, Giton, Tryphaena, and Ascyltos. The “vulgar” Latin of the freedmen does not betray any unusually strong Greek qualities, which would show them to be Petronius’ faithful representation of the speech-mannerisms of this particular ethnic minority in Rome. Grecisms are widespread in the *Satyrica* and it is in this context that we must read Grecisms in the speeches of the freedmen. Adams’ claim that “[a]t least one of the freedmen in Petronius (Hermeros) speaks a form of Latin which must have been meant to suggest a Greek or bilingual background” cannot be dismissed lightly, since it is advanced in an authoritative investigation of bilingualism and Latin.⁵⁴⁹ However, as Adams points out in the same context, speakers in

⁵⁴⁸ Williams 1968, 254.

⁵⁴⁹ Adams 2003, 21. It is mostly in exclamations (37.9, *babae*; 58.2, *io*; 58.3, *euge*; 58.7, *deuro de*) that Hermeros switches into Greek. Adams notes in passing on p. 27 that Hermeros’ Grecisms are rare or unattested elsewhere in Latin, so that the possibility of direct borrowings from a hypotext would therefore seem more likely. On Grecisms in the *Satyrica*, cf.

the plays of Plautus switch occasionally in the same manner into Greek in exclamations and interjections. Grecisms are frequent in the Menippean satires of Varro. Literary history in fact abounds with examples of translation resulting in macaronic texts of some sort, since translators must of necessity be bilingual. Since the *Satyrica* shares it with known palimpsests, this quality of the text is not necessarily a sign of linguistic realism, let alone of a radically independent method of composition. On the contrary, the Greek hypotexts that Plautus and Varro were working with seem to have inspired written imitation of code switching. The cultural and linguistic mixture produced by the Roman method of rewriting Greek texts may at times resemble spoken bilingualism, but it has very different origins and relates differently to reality. The modern impression of linguistic realism in the *Satyrica* is therefore accidental and follows directly from the late nineteenth-century assumption of European philologists that Petronius' writerly intention must have been to document the contemporary scene in the manner of contemporary literary Naturalists. The impression of linguistic realism in the *Satyrica* is therefore neither simple nor natural; on the contrary, it is arrived at backwards from a foregone conclusion, a way of thinking and perceiving that belongs primarily to European *fin de siècle* culture. In contrast, ancient mimicry of speech mannerisms aims at ridiculing the subjects who are imitated and never shows the modern interest in preserving an accurate image of their ways for the sake of scientifically inspired documentation.

It is clearly unrealistic that the Latin of the genuine and educated Greeks of the story is the colloquial Latin of educated Romans, while the Latin of the Romanized Greeks of the story is the language of native speakers among the lower orders, always the legitimate target of ridicule in stratified ancient Mediterranean societies. No doubt, the uneducated characters of the Greek work adapted by Petronius spoke a colloquial and solecistic Greek and Petronius decided to retain this feature in his Latin adaptation along with some important "untranslatables" such as the Greek exclamations in Hermeros' language. The fragments of Greek prosimetric narratives, the Iolaos (*POxy* 3010) and Tinouphis (*PHaun* inv. 400), show signs of loose writing and "vulgarity" of language.⁵⁵⁰ Sisenna's adaptation of the *Μιλησιακά* of Aristides seems to have been in that style too (cf. *Fro. Aur.* 4.3.2), and judging from the plain language of the epitome of the Greek Ass-Story and Apuleius' attempts to imply colloquial language without actually writing in that mode, the *Μεταμορφώσεις* probably exhibited examples of linguistic mim-

also Salenius 1927, 22-24 and Boyce 1991, 92.

⁵⁵⁰ According to Stephens and Winkler 1995, 367, both texts contain "a number of vulgarisms and uncorrected errors in both the prose and the verse sections of the text."

icry, which in general is a feature of *sermocinatio* in performance literature. Once the acting of lowly social types hits the stage in performance literature, the mimicry of their speech mannerisms is irresistible.

The nature of the linguistic errors of the freedmen is akin to Trimalchio's mistakes in mythology; they are errors by design for the sake of humor, since they systematically subvert the correct myths in a way that no true ignoramus could accomplish. Trimalchio's *persona* is the creation of an educated mind. Niceros' ghost story (61.3–62.14), likewise, is deliberately mistold and the character appropriately fears the mocking laughter of the *scholastici* (*Sat.* 61.4), not because Latin is his second language, but because he is violating the principles of good rhetorical narration. When all is considered, the language of the freedmen in the *Satyrica* is no harder to account for in a Roman adaptation of a Greek text than the language of the Greek characters of Plautus, another traditional source for “vulgar” Latin.

Trimalchio's antics at one point offer an interesting example of Latinization as he overlays the Greek of the Homeric poems with a Latin translation. When his *Homeristae* are ‘insolently’ exchanging Homeric verses in Greek, he drowns their recital by reading loudly a Latin translation of Homer to his guests (*Sat.* 59.3). In the same manner of overwriting the Greek voices of the *Satyrica*, Plocamus, one of Trimalchio's guests, is made to assert that his own “abominable hissing” is Greek (*Sat.* 64.5), but the Massalio Encolpius is unable to confirm this in his witty Latin narrative, as if his knowledge of Greek was that of a native Roman, limited to the correct literary Greek of school exercises.

A further paradoxical blending is apparent when the Greek characters Encolpius and Eumolpus, while describing and discussing the works of Greek artists and thinkers, self-alienatingly refer to them as “Greeks” (*Sat.* 83.2, *Graeci*) and even “crazy little Greeks” (*Sat.* 88.10, *Graeculi delirantes*), as if they were assuming a patronizing Roman attitude towards themselves. Although the latter is obviously ironic, the former is spoken by Encolpius in all seriousness in a simple reference to a Greek term (*Sat.* 83.2, *quam Graeci ‘Monocnemon’ appellant* [“whom the Greeks call ‘The Single-Greaved’”]). What Encolpius should have said, if he were a simple Latin-speaking Greek, is *quam nos Graeci ‘Monocnemon’ appellamus* (“whom we Greeks call ‘The Single-Greaved’”). Something strange is going on here, as Müller indirectly admits by wanting to delete *Graeci*, just as Fraenkel wanted to delete *Graeco more* in Eumolpus' description of the type of burial intended in his Ephesian story (*Sat.* 111.3). Neither place is unsound, however, according to the logic of Roman adaptations. Consistent with this logic, the *urbs Graeca* in the middle of Roman territory is seen by our Greek exile

not as a congenial and hospitable place, but on the contrary as a “foreign place” (*locus peregrinus*). Encolpius, the exile from Massalia, may of course view another Greek city as “foreign”, but this sense is excluded by the manner in which he emphasizes the Greek identity of the place in a parallel passage which follows soon after (80.8, *in loco peregrino* [“in a foreign place”]; 81.3, *exul in deversorio Graecae urbis iacerem desertus* [“an exile, a lonely figure in this lodging in a Greek city”]). Because the place is Greek, it is foreign to Encolpius the Greek, who has been adapted into Latin.

No ancient author dramatizes the process of Latin adaptations of Greek works as well as Apuleius, who rightly or wrongly prided himself on equal command of both languages.⁵⁵¹ In adapting the Μεταμορφώσεις, he has added a whole new frame to the work to account for the new language in which Loukios/Lucius now narrates his story. Whereas Λούκιος, the narrator and hero of the Μεταμορφώσεις, returns to his home city of Patrai after his adventures are over, Lucius of the *Metamorphoses* gets involved with the cult of Isis, which he did not need to do considering that he knew already that roses, easily attainable flowers in the spring, were the antidote to his asinine condition. His involvement with the cult eventually lands him in Rome, where he acquires the Latin language with great hardship, so that he can tell the story in that language (*Met.* 1.1). In the prologue of the *Metamorphoses* Lucius is made to apologize for being a foreign speaker, and refers explicitly to the change of language as *vocis immutatio* (1.1), and his Latin adaptation as *fabula Graecanica* (1.1). Although this translation into Latin and translocation to Rome is only mentioned briefly in the prologue, the general circumstances of Lucius in Rome are fleshed out in book eleven (11.28), and it becomes clear that he has been all along in the center of Rome, where he lives as a resident foreigner, *advena*, formally associated with the temple of Isis in the Martian Field. Although he was *tunc* (in the past tense of the story) a noble Greek-speaking youth, he is *nunc* (in the present tense of the narrating act) a bilingual Greek orator in Rome, virtually fluent in Latin, a language he first learned after his suffering at the hands of Thessalian witches was well into the past (*Met.* 11.26).

The humor of Lucius’ *vocis immutatio* with respect to Apuleius’ Latin adaptation of the Μεταμορφώσεις did not go unnoticed by the editor Rudolf Helm: *Servavit autem Apuleius Lucii nomen, quem ut ipse res posset narrare, linguam Latinam didicisse facete dicit* (“Apuleius kept the name of Lucius, and in order that he might himself tell the story, he wittily claims

⁵⁵¹ Apul. *Fl.* 18, *vox mea utraque lingua iam vestris auribus [...] cognita* (“my voice now familiar to your ears in both languages”). But see Beaujeu 1973, xi-xii, for possible errors made by Apuleius in translating from Greek.

that he learnt the Latin language”).⁵⁵² The change of language in the narrative voice of Lucius provides some interesting discrepancies in the *Metamorphoses*. In addition to making Lucius apologize for his foreign accent, he emphasizes that Latin is not the proper tongue in the implied world of the story, when the ass tries to save himself by “invoking the august name of Caesar amidst those crowds of Greeks in my native tongue” (3.29, *inter turbelas Graecorum genuino sermone nomen augustum Caesaris invocare*). Just like Encolpius and Eumolpus in the *Satyrica*, the adapted Lucius here assumes a patronizing attitude towards his former Greek ethnicity. Again the *vocis immutatio* is evident in an incident taken from the Μεταμορφώσεις, as we know from its reflection in the epitome, Λούκιος ἢ Ὀνος (44). In the Greek work the ass’ owner, a poor Greek gardener, while traveling along a highway, is arrogantly addressed in Latin by a Roman soldier, a language he does not know. In the Latin *Metamorphoses* the poor man tries to explain that he doesn’t know Latin and the Roman soldier turns out to be bilingual and so he repeats his words in Greek, “where are you taking this ass?” (*ubi ducis asinum istum?*). The gardener then answers the soldier equally *Graece*, except that his words are also written in Latin (9.39), implying that in this story the Latin language functions as the equivalent of the Greek language. What is said in Latin is unintelligible, although the narrator reports its contents in indirect speech, but what is said in Greek is represented as direct speech in Latin. In the story of Psyche, however, Apollo, “although a Greek and an Ionian” (*quamquam Graecus et Ionicus*), is jokingly said to have given an oracular response in Latin “as a favor to the writer of this Milesia” (4.32, *propter Milesiae conditorem*). The omniscient god was in any case known to be a polyglot.⁵⁵³

Despite Apuleius’ humorous attempt to account within the fictional world of the *Metamorphoses* for the irregularities resulting from the reworking in Latin of preexisting Greek texts, he does not seek to avoid wholly the giveaway symptoms of this process, and sometimes even exploits the discrepancy for its comic potential. For example, he lets an uneducated Greek slave boy begin an angry tirade against Lucius in the form of an ass with a clear echo from Cicero’s first oration against Catilina: *quo usque tandem* (3.27). In the characteristically Greek story of young Psyche, set in Asia Minor, which was possibly found in the Μεταμορφώσεις,⁵⁵⁴ the Greek gods behave, much like their counterparts in the *Apocolocyntosis*, as if they were

⁵⁵² Helm 1993, vi.

⁵⁵³ The oracle of Ptoan Apollo once delivered an answer in “Carian” (Hdt. 8.135).

⁵⁵⁴ As is shown, e.g., by the alteration of the language of the oracle from Greek to Latin (*Met.* 4.32). For further discussion, see Dietze 1900, 136f.

the proud members of the Roman senatorial class. Jupiter claims, for example, that Cupid has driven him to violate public morality and specifically the *lex Iulia* (6.22), a famous Roman law criminalizing adultery, which was passed under Augustus in 18 B.C.E. And similarly, the prize offered by Venus for the recovery of Psyche is a French kiss, and the informant is to meet with the goddess behind the *metae Murtiae* (6.8) in Rome, which was so called because it was close to the temple of Venus Murcia. It is evident from this reference to a temple in Rome in the middle of a story set in Asia Minor that, even in a *narratio* in the *persona* of an old woman situated in Thessaly, the primary location in Rome of the narrator of the Latin adaptation intrudes. As such this would be a breach of the rules of narration, if it were not for the fact that this text is a Roman adaptation. In Gordon Williams' words, what the Roman adaptor of Greek works "created, almost by accident, was a world of imagination that was in its main essence Greek but into which he fitted things Roman with such gay abandon that the resulting world was pure ideal creation."⁵⁵⁵

To return to the *Satyrica*, we note the same mixture in witty analogies from Roman history used by Greek characters, as for example in the comparison of Ascylos' rape of Giton to Tarquinius' rape of Lucretia (9.5). Dialogues like these can only take place in the never-never land of Roman reworkings of Greek texts. As I noted at the beginning of this section, studies of its intertextual relationship with other Roman works are important, even if the work as a whole is based on a Greek text, because of the many Roman elements in the *Satyrica*. In fact, given my conclusion that the *Satyrica* is essentially a hybrid, a Latin adaptation of a Greek work written in a multiplicity of discourse types, variety of filiation is inescapable. My hypothesis is therefore quite compatible with much of the scholarship on the *Satyrica* to date, despite its revision of the premises on which most studies rest. The main difference is perhaps that the Roman material in the *Satyrica* can no longer be adduced as evidence of Petronius' *Romanitas* or "originality". The whole question of the origin of those elements of the work which modern scholarship often too hastily assumes to be purely "Roman", viz. satire and mime, is indeed made more complicated, since we must now reckon with the possibility that the Greek hypotext of the *Satyrica* was already both satirical and influenced by the mime.⁵⁵⁶

⁵⁵⁵ Williams 1968, 288.

⁵⁵⁶ The recent claim of Panayotakis 1995, x, for example, that "farical features which recur throughout the narrative support the interpretation of this composite text as an eccentric innovation in the area of literature" is therefore not an argument.

3.2.6 Massaliotic Miliesia

To add further support to our reading of the *Satyrica* as *fabula Miliesia*, we present hitherto unnoticed ancient evidence that such is, indeed, the correct term to describe the erotic fiction of Petronius. A letter by Sidonius Apollinaris to a certain Graecus, who was bishop of Massalia, tells the scandalous and erotic, though not pornographic, story of their letter-carrier Amantius.⁵⁵⁷ The interesting parts about this otherwise undistinguished literary exercise in a private letter are clear verbal and thematic echoes from the *Satyrica* in a narrative which is then defined as *fabula Miliesia*. We have Sidonius Apollinaris, of course, to thank for the preservation of an important Fragment (*Fr.* II) of the *Satyrica*, and so we know with certainty that he was to some extent familiar with Petronius' text. Practically his only other references to Massalia belong to the other letters he wrote to Graecus. In the letter in question (*Ep.* 7.2) Sidonius apologizes humorously for having introduced Amantius to the bishop as their letter-carrier, because the same man had previously abused the good will of Eustachius, Graecus' predecessor as bishop of Massalia. Sidonius portrays the character of Amantius as a "wily traveler" (*callidus viator*) who has spun a yarn utterly at variance with the truth and caused him to repeat the false information. But then he promises to tell the bishop the story of Amantius, which would make a pleasant tale, he says, if told by a worthy narrator (*quae tamen gesta sunt, si quispiam dignus relator revolveret, fierent iucunda memoratu*). Responding to a previous demand from the bishop for a cheerful read, he begins the story of Amantius in the Greek style by naming the home city and parents of the hero.

When Amantius had first arrived in Massalia as a penniless youth he had exploited the blessing of the bishop to insinuate himself into good society, which he deceived by making a spectacle of his chastity and sobriety; after having the good citizens of Massalia compete in giving him gifts and granting favors, he began seducing the prepubescent daughter of a certain lady of good fortune. The passage is worth quoting in full, since it contains verbal echoes from the *Satyrica*:

forte accidit, ut deversorio, cui ipse successerat, quaedam femina non minus censu quam moribus idonea vicinaretur, cuius filia infantiae iam temporibus emensis necdum tamen nubilibus annis appropinquabat. huic hic blandus (siquidem ea aetas infantulae, ut adhuc decenter) nunc quae-

⁵⁵⁷ This letter is not entirely accurately referred to by Ruiz-Montero 1996, 63 n.153, as an example of "non-licentious" *Miliesiae* in an attempt to support the expansion of the meaning of the term to cover "stories of a sentimental or idealist kind."

dam frivola, nunc ludo apta virgineo scruta donabat; quibus isti parum grandibus causis plurimum virgunculæ animus copulabatur. anni obiter thalamo pares: quid morer multis? adulescens, solus tenuis peregrinus, filius familias et e patria patre non solum non volente verum et ignorante discedens, puellam non inferiorem natalibus, facultatibus superiorem, medio episcopo, quia lector, solacio comitis, quia cliens, socru non inspiciente substantiam, sponsa non despiciente personam, uxorem petit, impetrat, ducit. conscribuntur tabulae nuptiales; et siqua est istic municipioli nostri suburbanitas, matrimonialibus illic inserta documentis mimica largitate recitatur.

It happened that near the lodging where he was staying there lived a certain lady as well suited in income as in character, whose daughter, though no longer a baby, was still not even close to marriageable age. With this child he ingratiated himself (her tender years still allowing it without impropriety), and would give her from time to time some frivolous gifts or trinkets suitable for the play of a maiden. And for these less than great reasons he came to occupy an intimate place in the little virgin's mind. The years came when she was ready for the marriage chamber. Not to make a long story of it, this young man, alone and of modest resources, a stranger, a minor who left his native city not only without the consent but without the knowledge of his father, sought, won, and married a girl of not inferior birth and superior fortune, with the mediation of the bishop, because he was a reader, and with the sympathy of the count, because he was a client; for the mother did not look into his means any more than the girl looked down upon his person. The nuptial tables are written out, and what rustic eloquence could be found in our little municipal town was entered in the matrimonial documents and recited with theatrical pomposity.

Sidonius then ends the tale of Amantius with the words: "here you have the history of a splendid young man, a fable equal to a Milesia or an Attic play" (*habetis historiam iuvenis eximii, fabulam Milesiae vel Atticae parem*). Once again *historia* and *fabula* are two terms which can be used to refer to the same narrative, which supports our previous point that the word *fabula* in Latin does not have the connotation of a "short story". The fable is alternatively an Attic "play" (*fabula*) for no other reason than Sidonius, in the preceding sentence, referred to Amantius mockingly as *noster Hippolytus*.

Above and beyond the Massaliotic connection (the story is set in Massalia and Sidonius knew Petronius and associated him with that city), we

have here rather close thematic and verbal parallels with a number of stories and episodes in the extant *Satyrica*. As in the episode at Croton, a poor traveler and trickster arrives as a stranger in a foreign city, simulates virtue and high social status and succeeds in having the citizens compete (*certatim*) in giving gifts and granting their favors (*Sat.* 124.4, *cum certamine in Eumolpum congesserunt ... certatim omnes heredipetae muneribus gratiam Eumolpi sollicitant*). Day by day (*in dies*) the stranger's status improves and the beneficence (*beneficiis*) of the citizens increases (*Sat.* 125.1, *beneficio amicorum; 2, quotidie magis magisque superfluentibus bonis*). The stranger, pretending to be a paragon of virtue, is taken into the house of a certain lady, where he succeeds in seducing the child of the family aided by cheap presents. The parallel with Eumolpus' seduction of the Pergamene boy (*Sat.* 85–87) and again his “seduction” of Philomela's daughter (*Sat.* 140) by posing as a virtuous educator is not difficult to see. The theme of effective, though eccentric, wooing echoes the story of the widow of Ephesus, where the soldier gives the widow gifts of food (compare *huic hic blandus* with *Sat.* 112.1, *quibus blanditiis*).

Most striking, however, is the verbal echo in Sidonius' *Milesia* of the bizarre narrative of the deflowering of the girl Pannychis in the Quartilla episode of the *Satyrica* (16–26). We find here no less than nine verbal parallels, some of which involve both rare and extremely rare words (*thalamus*, *scruta*, *virguncula*), which are not used by Sidonius elsewhere, not to mention one instance of a concentration within six lines of the extant *Satyrica* (18.7–19.2) of three such words (*virguncula*, *mimicus*, *deversorium*).⁵⁵⁸ Such conceptual and semantic reminiscences would seem unlikely, if the texts are unrelated.

Considering the number of similarities it seems unlikely, though not impossible, that Sidonius' account goes back to some general narrative template. It does, however, seem most probable that Sidonius was using as a model the *Satyrica* of Petronius, a work he demonstrably knew to some ex-

⁵⁵⁸ deversorio (*Sat.* 19.2 *deversorio*); filia infantiae iam temporibus emensis necdum tamen nubiiis annis appropinquabat (*Sat.* 25, *plaudentibus ergo universis et postulantibus nuptias ... nec puellam eius aetatis esse, ut muliebris patientiae legem posset accipere*); huic hic blandus, siquidem ea aetas infantulae ut adhuc decenter (*Sat.* 25, *infans [...] inquinata sum*); scruta (*Sat.* 62.1, *scruta*); virguncula (*Sat.* 18, *virguncula, quae una intraverat*; 20, *virguncula cervicem eius invasit et non repugnanti puero innumerabilia oscula dedit*); thalamo (*Sat.* 26, *thalamumque incesta exornaverant veste*; 26, *consedimus ante limen thalami*); sponsa non despiciente personam (*Sat.* 13, *personam vendentis contemptam*, 18, *contemni turpe est ... sapiens contemptus*); siqua est istic municipioli nostri suburbanitas (*Sat.* 24, *hominem acutum ac urbanitatis vernaculae fontem*); mimica largitate recitatur (*Sat.* 19.1, *omnia mimico risu exonuerant*).

tent at least (cf. Fragment IV, and discussion in section 2.1.3), when he composed his humorous account of Amantius' profitable erotic adventure in Massalia. In that case, the letter would provide specific evidence that the generic term *Milesia* is indeed the correct one for denoting the genre of the *Satyrica*. This fits the information that we have from Macrobius, that Petronius and Apuleius were judged in late antiquity to be writers of playful *fabulae* about fictional lovers (*argumenta fictis casibus amatorum referta* ["stories of everyday life crammed with the fictitious stories of lovers"]) as entertainment (*tantum conciliandae auribus voluptatis* ["only for pleasing the ears"]); *hoc totum fabularum genus, quod solas aurium delicias profitetur* ["this whole species of fables, which offers mere delights for the ears"].⁵⁵⁹

What is striking in Macrobius' description of the genre of amatory fiction practiced by Petronius and Apuleius is the programmatic language he uses to describe these works, especially his mention of "stories crammed with stories" and the repeated emphasis on "delighting the ears". We do not have the opening words of the *Satyrica*, but from the prologue of the *Metamorphoses* and from scattered references throughout the text it is clear that the weaving of a web of narratives (cf. *Met.* 1.1. *uarias fabulas conseram*) and the emphasis on delighting the ears (1.1, *uresque tuas beniuolas lepido susurro permulceam*) are indeed conscious programmatic statements and a description of the genre of *Milesiae*. Although "cramming" stories into stories is not the same as the metaphor of weaving narratives, both could well describe the same thing. This is the meta-language of storytelling and as we have shown the peculiar "personal" travelogue of both the *Satyrica* and the *Metamorphoses* is uniquely suited, because of the elasticity or expandability of the form, to the accommodation of a seemingly endless series of inserted narratives, speeches and poems. Although Macrobius refers to this literary form only as *fabula*, its full name according to Apuleius is *fabula Milesia*, and its origin goes back to a single work written no earlier than around the end of the second century B.C.E. This work is the Μιλησιακά, which was narrated (but not necessarily written) by Aristides. Thanks to our modeling of the narrative structure of the *Satyrica* and the *Metamorphoses* of Apuleius, we are now able to formulate new and stronger arguments than previous scholars were able to offer that this lost second-century B.C.E. text was the first ancient literary text that deserves the generic title of novel. We know that Apuleius himself defined the *Metamorphoses* as *fabula Milesia* and now we have a strong indication that Petronius' *Satyrica* was classified by Macrobius as a *Milesia*. Macrobius, in fact, seems to think of Petronius' work as

⁵⁵⁹ Macrobius, *Somn.* 1.2.7–8. The passage is quoted in full and translated in section 3.1.4.

better representative of the genre than the *Metamorphoses* (*multum se Arbitr exercuit ... Apuleium non numquam lusisse miramur* [“Arbiter exercised himself greatly ... we are amazed that Apuleius occasionally indulged”]).

With respect to the mixture of prose and poetry in the *Satyrica*, this too might be a part of the generic description of *Milesiae*. Edward Norden long ago suggested that the Μιλησιακά of Aristides was prosimetric in form.⁵⁶⁰ The evidence cited by Norden includes the presence of Sisenna, the Latin adaptor of the work, in a list of poets by M. Cornelius Fronto (*Aur.* 4.3.2) with a clear enough reference to the *Milesiae* (*in lasciviis*). In addition, Bücheler rightly pointed out that *Fr.* VII (*nocte vagatrix*) of Sisenna’s adaptation must be poetry, judging from the rhythm and diction. However, Felix Jacoby was probably right to consider erroneous Norden’s interpretation of *Fr.* CXXVII of Sisenna’s *Historiae* as a description of the desultory style.⁵⁶¹ Direct proof, overlooked by Norden and Bücheler, is provided by Martianus Capella, who in a work which itself is written in the prosimetric form refers, as we have seen above, to “delightful Milesiae of poetic diversity” (*poeticae etiam diversitatis delicias Milesias*).⁵⁶² Considering the latest discoveries of prosimetric papyri of Greek sensational erotic and criminal fiction, the case for prosimetric *Milesiae* is convincing.

According to Lucian, the author of the *Sybaritica* (described by Ovid as comparable to the Μιλησιακά of Aristides) went by the name of Hemitheon (or Minthon), and was furthermore called “the *cinaedus*”.⁵⁶³ This “author” is most certainly a fictional narrator. Since Hemitheon is referred to as “the *cinaedus*” he belongs to the group of writers and performers generally referred to as κιναιδολόγοι, the imitators of Sotades and Timon of Phlius. They were so named because they sang or recited their compositions.⁵⁶⁴ If the

⁵⁶⁰ Norden 1909, 756, and 603 n.5, writes, regarding the characterization of Apuleius’ style as *desultoriae scientiae stilus*, “Varro schrieb eine Satire *Desultorius* περί τοῦ γράφειν, was schon Buecheler im Rhein. Mus. XX (1865) 408, 6 aus dem sprungweisen Wechsel dieser Kompositionsart nach Inhalt und, was bei Varro, Seneca, Petron, Martian und Boethius hinzukommt, nach Form (cf. auch Bekker Anecd. Gr. 198, 11 s. ἀναβάτης), erklärt hat. Hätten wir den Roman des Aristeides, so würden wir die sprunghafte Art der Darstellung an der Quelle studieren können.”

⁵⁶¹ For Jacoby’s criticism, see Norden 1909, “Nachträge, 5, Zu S. 603.5.” Gel. 12.15.2, *ne vellicatim aut saltuatim scribendo lectorum animos impediremus* (“so that in our writing we shall not impede our readers’ minds by picking out items here and there or by leaping from one subject to another”).

⁵⁶² Mart. Cap. *de Nupt.*, 2.100.

⁵⁶³ Lucian *Ind.* 23; *Pseudol.* 3.

⁵⁶⁴ Demetr. *Eloc.* 37; Plb. 5.37.10; Plin. *Ep.* 9.17.1; Str. C648. Maxwell 1993 argues that these compositions were mimes, which is ultimately a matter of terminology. I do not wish to argue that Sotades and Timon were “novelists”. If the category of mime is made to include

author of the *Sybaritica* was a *cinaedus*, the work itself was a performance text in the mixed form, related to the *Satyrica* (23.2, 132) and the *Iolaos* fragment, both of which feature prosimetric presentations of cinaedic poetry.⁵⁶⁵

Plutarch probably contains another previously unnoticed reference to the *Sybaritica* in the context of the *Milesiaca*. At the end of the *Life of Crassus*, he tells the story of how the work of Aristides (presumably its Latin adaptation by Sisenna) was found in the baggage of the Roman military man Roscius, and how this gave the Parthian Surena an occasion to heap insults on the defeated Romans. But then, curiously, Plutarch adds that Surena's attack was not successful because "the people of Seleucia, nevertheless, appreciated the wisdom of Aesop when they saw Surena with a *pera* stuffed with obscenities from the Μιλησιακά in front of him, but trailing behind him a Parthian Sybaris in so many wagon-loads of concubines."⁵⁶⁶ Plutarch is here casting Surena as the man in the fable of Aesop (# 303) carrying one πήρα in front of him with others' faults, while dragging behind him his own. The "Parthian Sybaris", of course, is the retinue of Surena, but Plutarch also claims that the Parthians had no business criticizing the Romans, since many of their royal line were sprung from Milesian courtesans. However, the choice of the phrase, "Parthian Sybaris", would not make much sense unless it contained an indirect reference to the Συβαριτικά of Hemitheon, which thus would provide the desired parallel to the work of Aristides. It is perhaps of some significance that in Plutarch a scandalous and sensational description follows upon this mention of the two works, featuring a prosimetric performance in the Parthian camp of the *Bacchae* of Euripides, using the

many types of performances, which in antiquity seems to have been the case, the *Satyrica* could in theory be lumped together with the many species of mime on the grounds of being performance literature without this implying at all that it was dramatic in form. However, one problem regarding the classification of the *Satyrica* as mime (not a part of Maxwell's thesis) is that it ignores the evidence that there was already in use among Latin writers another generic term, *milesia fabula*, for this type of work.

⁵⁶⁵ On the origin of cinaedic poetry, see Ath. 620e; Plaut. *Stich.* 769. Although both the *Μεταμορφώσεις* and the *Metamorphoses* feature cinaedi without the prosimetric presentation of cinaedic poetry, their presence can still be considered a generic marker. It is an open question whether the Greek *Metamorphoseis* were prosimetric and if so why Apuleius did not retain the form. Is it possible that Apuleius' adaptation, with all its philosophizing and religious overtones, represents an attempt to ennoble the form of *Milesia*? Is that why his remains the only fully extant *Milesia*?

⁵⁶⁶ Plut. *Crass.* 32.4, τοῖς μέντοι Σελευκεῦσιν ἐδόκει σοφὸς ἀνὴρ Αἴσωπος εἶναι, τὸν Σουρήναν ὀρώσει τὴν τῶν Μιλησιακῶν ἀκολαστημάτων πήραν ἐξηρημένον πρόσθεν, ὅπισθεν δὲ Παρθικὴν Σύβαριν ἐφελκόμενον ἐν τοσαύταις παλλακίδων ἀμάξαις.

head of Crassus for that of Pentheus during the recital of the verses of Agave.

As a city, Sybaris was proverbial for the same quality that made the Milesians notorious, luxury and licentious behavior. Hesychius counts Συβαριτικός as synonymous with τρυφερός, the weakness from which Petronius' Tryphaena gets her name, and numerous ancient sources are scandalized at the unrestrained catering at the proverbial "Sybaritic table" (τράπεζα Συβαριτική). What we are dealing with is a "tradition of malicious erotic ethnography"⁵⁶⁷ and the mythologized identities of Greek cities. The setting for the last episode of the extant *Satyrica* is the city of Croton. At the beginning of this episode we find the only intact introduction to a Greek city in the story as we have it.

Why Croton? What wars are being referred to in the introduction of Croton as a city, which has 'squandered its wealth in frequent wars' (*Sat.* 116, *post attritas bellis frequentibus opes*)? The ancient Greek colony of Croton (Κρότων) is best known in literature for destroying great and luxurious Sybaris in 510 B.C.E. Sybaris had been closely affiliated with wealthy and powerful Miletus, which, in turn, saw its golden age end in the late fifth century. Like luxurious Sybaris and wealthy Miletus, powerful Croton is a legend of the distant past, from the period after the Greek colonial expansion. Such tales of life in famous ancient cities may have been termed "city legends" (μῦθοι πολιτικοί).⁵⁶⁸

If the Greek hypotext of Petronius' *Satyrica* was not called simply Σατυρικά, which seems most probable and would have associated the work with Greek satyr drama (δρᾶμα σατυρικόν or δράματα σατυρικά), another possible title is Μασσαλιωτικά, given the home city of the narrator and the tradition of naming such narratives after places. Most likely, though, Petronius' title *Satyrica* preserves the original title of the Greek work.⁵⁶⁹ The adventures of Enkolpion in the original Greek story must have been to some extent a parody of the Phaeacian tales of his reputedly mendacious countrymen, Pythias and Euthymenes. Instead of spinning their kind of μῦθοι Μασσαλιωτικοί, however, he weaves his own Sybaritic tale.⁵⁷⁰ Instead of

⁵⁶⁷ Harrison 1998, 63.

⁵⁶⁸ Schol. *Ar. Vesp.* 1259a.

⁵⁶⁹ Henriksson 1956, 185, in his study of Greek book titles in Roman literature, concludes "dass die aus dem griechischen übersetzten Werke sehr oft den Titel des Originals behielten. Dasselbe gilt für Werke, die nach einem griechischen Vorbild inhaltlich oder stilistisch geformt sind." At least one Greek work was entitled Σατυρικά, written by a certain Derkyllos (Ps.-Plut. *Fluv.* 10.3, *FGrH* III A, 172).

⁵⁷⁰ Aelius Aristides *Aeg.* p.353 [Jebb] makes fun of the fourth century B.C.E. historian Ephoros, who originated in Cumae, and was therefore from Magna Graecia, for abandoning

going beyond the Pillars of Hercules, he leaves his home city Massalia to go south along the Italian peninsula to expose the lies and hypocrisy of Greek (and Roman?) communities in that area.⁵⁷¹ Just as the *Μεταμορφώσεις* tells a story of superstitious Thessaly, the *Σατυρικά* offered a Greek satire on the degradation of the Hellenic communities in the Diaspora under Roman rule. Neapolis is a city of bogus erudition and voracious appetites, Croton of lost greatness and cannibalistic greed. The *vilicus* in the Latin *Satyrica* appears out of nowhere to supply our friends with information about Croton as a non-literary place where there is no place for eloquence (116.6), as if he wanted to clearly differentiate the present city from the last one, philoscholastic Neapolis.

No doubt very ancient μῦθοι πολιτικοί provided the basis for composing these longer narratives, the *Milesiae*, which absorb a number of such tales into a central fable and so create an extended and entertaining performance narrative by including a variety of material and discourse types. Those who cultivated this art must have been men who like Apuleius looked upon themselves as rhetoricians and even philosophers. Petronius, too, whoever he was, clearly had considerable scholastic training and was familiar with the contemporary philosophical schools. A significant input obviously came from Cynic satire, which as a performance genre was well established in the third century B.C.E., i.e., early enough to have influenced the form and general outlook of the *Milesiae*. As I have shown in this study, the underlying literary and ethical concerns of Encolpius and his implied audience are closely related to some of the basic theses of the Cynic philosophers, who invented the mixed discourse and rejected money and all that it represented as a reliable measure of value—“redefine the currency” (παραχάραξον τὸ νόμισμα) was the great metaphor and slogan of Diogenes of Sinope (D.L. 6.20f.).⁵⁷² Such moral concerns are of course presented in the genre accord-

his native Sybaritic tales for Massaliotic tales (μῦθοις Μασσαλιωτικοῖς ἀντὶ τῶν Συβαριτικῶν) because he was persuaded by Euthymenes' account of the origin of the Nile. The joke would hardly be intelligible without there being already in existence some disreputable “Massaliotic tales” comparable to *Sybaritica*.

⁵⁷¹ Reitzenstein 1963, 30f., “Es war ein glücklicher Gedanke für die Wunderbare Fahrt an unbekanntenen Küsten und die Abenteuer mit Fabelvölkern und Märchenwesen eine Reise längs der allbekanntenen Küste Galliens und Italiens einzusetzen, und jede neue Stadt zur typischen Vertreterin eines neuen Lasters zu machen.”

⁵⁷² A valuable but neglected source on the history and ideas of Cynicism is the Cynic letters, most of which derive from the Augustan period (Malherbe 1986, 2 and 14). Diogenes' *Epistles* 30–40, in particular, contain material which is often strangely reminiscent of passages in the *Satyrica*. We have here the same emphasis on the wandering human explorer who goes from city to city and is exemplified by such heroic figures as the beggar Odysseus

ing to the seriocomic style appropriate to popular philosophy as entertainment. We also find a good deal of erotic titillation and sensational violence—at times rather shocking and amoral elements—intermixed with the moral message, which although they seem to contradict the satire may to some extent have been intended as bait to attract audiences.

Because of the shamelessness and criminal delinquency of the *Milesiae*, dabbling in such literature could potentially ruin the reputation of otherwise honorable men.⁵⁷³ In every ancient reference to the genre, from Ovid to Martial through Plutarch to “Capitolinus”, we encounter excitement and fascination with *Milesiae* mixed with a strong sense of scandal and an urge to condemn. It is ironic that scholarship has so seldom followed antiquity in imputing the genre to Petronius, an author who, if his Tacitean portrait is at all accurate, would have regarded the imputation with wry equanimity.

(34.2–3); we also have striking instances of phallic humor and masturbation (35.2), and perhaps most remarkably the ridicule of stupid signs posted outside private houses in foreign cities (36.1).

⁵⁷³ The Cynics liked to shock the moral sensibilities of the ordinary man by arguing that various immoral activities could be sensible practices under certain circumstances, notwithstanding “public opinion” (δόξη), which they considered the very antithesis of wisdom. On the Cynics in general, see Dudley 1980, and the annotated bibliography of Navia 1995.

Abbreviations

<i>AAHG</i>	<i>Anzeiger für die Altertumswissenschaft. Österreichische Humanistische Gesellschaft</i>
<i>AAntHung</i>	<i>Acta Antiqua Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae</i>
<i>AAST</i>	<i>Atti della Accademia delle scienze di Torino</i>
<i>AC</i>	<i>L'antiquité classique</i>
<i>AJP</i>	<i>American Journal of Philology</i>
<i>AN</i>	<i>Ancient Narrative</i>
<i>ANRW</i>	H. Temporini, <i>Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt</i> , Berlin 1972
<i>ANQ</i>	<i>American Notes and Queries</i>
<i>AS</i>	<i>Ancient Society</i>
<i>BICS</i>	<i>Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies</i>
<i>CB</i>	<i>Classical Bulletin</i>
<i>CIL</i>	<i>Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum</i>
<i>CJ</i>	<i>Classical Journal</i>
<i>CP</i>	<i>Classical Philology</i>
<i>CQ</i>	<i>Classical Quarterly</i>
<i>CW</i>	<i>Classical World</i>
<i>FGrH</i>	F. Jacoby, <i>Fragmente der griechischen Historiker</i>
<i>G&R</i>	<i>Greece and Rome</i>
<i>GIF</i>	<i>Giornale italiano di filologia</i>
<i>GRBS</i>	<i>Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies</i>
<i>ICS</i>	<i>Illinois Classical Studies</i>
<i>JHS</i>	<i>Journal of Hellenic Studies</i>
<i>JMRS</i>	<i>Journal of Medieval and Renaissance Studies</i>
<i>JRS</i>	<i>Journal of Roman Studies</i>
<i>LCM</i>	<i>Liverpool Classical Monthly</i>
<i>MCr</i>	<i>Museum Criticum. Pisa</i>
<i>MCSN</i>	<i>Materiali e contributi per la storia della narrativa greco-latina</i>
<i>MD</i>	<i>Materiali e discussioni per l'analisi dei testi classici</i>
<i>MH</i>	<i>Museum Helveticum</i>
<i>NA</i>	<i>Nuova Antologia</i>
<i>NJKAP</i>	<i>Neue Jahrbücher für das klassische Altertum, Geschichte und deutsche Literatur und für Pädagogik</i>
<i>NJPhP</i>	<i>Neue Jahrbücher für Philologie und Pädagogik</i>
<i>OLD</i>	P. G. W. Glare, <i>Oxford Latin Dictionary</i> , Oxford 1968–82
<i>PHaun</i>	<i>Copenhagen Papyri</i>
<i>PCPS</i>	<i>Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society</i>
<i>PhW</i>	<i>Berliner philologische Wochenschrift</i>
<i>POxy</i>	<i>Oxyrhynchus Papyri</i>
<i>PSN</i>	<i>Petronian Society Newsletter</i>

<i>RAL</i>	<i>Rendiconti della classe di scienze morali, storiche e filologiche dell'Accademia dei Lincei</i>
<i>RE</i>	Pauli, Wissowa, and Kroll, <i>Real-Encyclopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft</i>
<i>REL</i>	<i>Revue des études latines</i>
<i>RFIC</i>	<i>Rivista di filologia e istruzione classica</i>
<i>RhM</i>	<i>Rheinisches Museum</i>
<i>RIGI</i>	<i>Rivista indo-greco-italica di filologia, lingua, antichità</i>
<i>RSC</i>	<i>Rivista di studia classica</i>
<i>SCI</i>	<i>Scripta Classica Israelica</i>
<i>TAPA</i>	<i>Transactions of the American Philological Association</i>
<i>TLL</i>	<i>Thesaurus Linguae Latinae</i> , Leipzig 1900–
<i>YCS</i>	<i>Yale Classical Studies</i>
<i>UTQ</i>	<i>University of Toronto Quarterly</i>
<i>WJA</i>	<i>Würtzburger Jahrbücher für die Altertumswissenschaft</i>

Bibliography

- Abbott, F. F. 1907. 'The use of language as a means of characterization in Petronius', *CP* 2, 43–50.
- Adamietz, J. (ed.) 1986. *Die römische Satire*, Darmstadt.
- 1987. 'Zum literarischen Charakter von Petrons *Satyrica*', *RhM* 130, 329–346.
- Adams, J. N. 1982. *The Latin Sexual Vocabulary*, Baltimore.
- 2003. *Bilingualism and the Latin Language*, Cambridge.
- Anderson, G. 1981. 'Trimalchio at Sousa-on-Sea', *AJP* 102, 50–53.
- 1993. *The Second Sophistic: A Cultural Phenomenon in the Roman Empire*, London – New York.
- Anderson, W. B. 1934. 'Notes on the *Carmina* of Apollinaris Sidonius', *CP* 28, 17–23.
- Anton, C. G. (ed.) 1781. *Petronii Arbitri Satyricon: ex recensione Petri Burmanni passim reficta cum supplementis Nodotianis et fragmentis Petronianis; notas criticas, aliasque et indicem uberrimum addidit Conr. Gottlob Antonius*, Leipzig.
- Aragosti, A. 1979. 'L'episodio petroniano del forum (Sat. 12–15)', *MD* 3, 101–109.
- 2000. *I frammenti dai Milesiarum libri di L. C. Sisenna*, Bologna.
- Arrowsmith, W. 1959 (new edn. 1987). *Petronius: The Satyricon; Translated and with an Introduction*, New York.
- 1966. 'Luxury and death in the *Satyricon*', *Arion* 5, 304–331.
- Astbury, R. 1977. 'Petronius, *P.Oxy.* 3010, and Menippean satire', *CP* 72, 23–31.
- Auerbach, E. 1953. *Mimesis: The Representation of Reality in Western Literature* (trans. W. R. Trask), Princeton.
- Austin, R. G. (ed.) 1980. *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos: liber secundus*, Oxford.
- Bacon, H. H. 1958. 'The Sibyl in the Bottle', *Virginia Quarterly Review* 34, 262–276.
- Bagnani, G. 1954. *Arbiter of Elegance*, Toronto.
- 1956. 'Encolpius *Gladiator obscenus*', *CP* 41, 23–27.
- Bailey, D. R. S. 1987. 'On Petronius', *AJP* 108, 458–464.
- Bakhtin, M. 1973. *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics* (trans. R. W. Rotsel), Ardis.
- 1981. *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays* (trans. C. Emerson and M. Holquist), Austin.
- 1986. *Speech Genres & Other Late Essays* (trans. V. W. McGee), Austin.
- Baldwin, B. 1973. 'Ira Priapi', *CP* 68, 294–296.
- Barandum, H. P. 1994. 'Notes on Editions and Translations of Petronius' *Satyricon*', *PSN* 24, 17–19.
- Barchiesi, A. 1986. 'Tracce di narrativa greca e romanzo latino: una rassegna', *MCSN* 4, 219–236.
- Barnes, E. J. 1971. *The Poems of Petronius* (Ph.D. diss., Toronto).
- Barnes, T. D. 1978. *The Sources of the Historia Augusta*, Bruxelles.
- Barthes, R. 1975. *The Pleasure of the Text* (trans. R. Miller), New York.
- 1978. *A Lover's Discourse: Fragments* (trans. R. Howard), New York.

- Barwick, B. 1928. 'Die Gliederung der Narratio in der Rhetorischen Theorie und ihre Bedeutung für die Geschichte des Antiken Romans', *Hermes* 63, 261–287.
- Beaujeu, J. 1973. *Apulée, Opuscules philosophiques (Du dieu de Socrate, Platon et sa doctrine, Du monde) et fragments*, Paris.
- Beck, R. 1973. 'Some observations on the narrative technique of Petronius', *Phoenix* 27, 42–61.
- 1975. 'Encolpius at the *Cena*', *Phoenix* 29, 271–283.
- 1979. 'Eumolpus poeta, Eumolpus fabulator', *Phoenix* 33, 239–253.
- 1982. 'The *Satyricon*: Satire, Narrator, and Antecedents', *MH* 39, 206–214.
- Beloch, J. 1890. *Campanien im Alterthum*, Breslau.
- Bendz, Gerhard. 1941. 'Sprachliche Bemerkungen zu Petron', *Eranos* 39, 27–55.
- Benediktson, D. T. 1990. 'Liberatum at Petronius *Satyricon* 54.5', *Mnemosyne* 43, 453–454.
- Best, E. E. 1965. 'Attitudes Towards Literacy Reflected in Petronius', *CJ* 61, 72–76.
- Bettini, M. 1982. 'A proposito dei versi sotadei greci e latini', *MD* 9, 59–105.
- Birt, T. 1896. 'Zu Catull und Petron', *RhM* 51 468–470.
- 1925. 'Zu Petron', *PhW* 45, 95–96.
- Blänsdorf, J. 1990. 'Die Werwolf-Geschichte des Niceros bei Petron als Beispiel literarischer Fiktion mündlichen Erzählens', in Vogt-Spira, G. (ed.), *Strukturen der Mündlichkeit in der römischen Literatur*, 193–217, Tübingen.
- Bloom, H. 1973. *The Anxiety of Influence: A Theory of Poetry*, Oxford – New York.
- Blümlein, G. 1971. *Die Trugreden des Odysseus* (diss. Frankfurt a. M.).
- Bodel, J. 1989. 'Trimalchio and the candelabrum', *CP* 84, 224–231.
- 1994. 'Trimalchio's Underworld', in Tatum (ed.), 237–259.
- Bogner, H. 1941. 'Petronius bei Tacitus', *Hermes* 76, 223–224.
- Bonner, S. F. 1977. *Roman Education*, Berkeley.
- Boyce, B. T. 1991. *The Language of the Freedmen in Petronius' Cena Trimalchionis*, Leiden.
- Bowie, E. L., and S. J. Harrison. 1993. 'The Romance of the Novel', *JRS* 83, 159–178.
- Brandt, O. 1990. '*Lapidariae litterae*', *Eranos* 88, 163–165.
- Branham, R. B. 1989. *Unruly Eloquence: Lucian and the Comedy of Traditions*, Cambridge, Mass.
- Branham, R. B. and D. Kinney. 1997. *Petronius: Satyricon*, Berkeley – Los Angeles.
- Braund, D. 1993. 'Piracy under the Principate and the Ideology of Imperial Eradication', in Rich and Shipley (eds.), London – New York, 195–212.
- Bright, D. F., and E. S. Ramage (eds.) 1984. *Classical Texts and Their Traditions: Studies in Honor of C. R. Trahman*, Chico, California.
- Bücheler, F., and G. Heräus (eds.) 1862 (6th edn. 1922). *Petronii Saturae et Liber Priapeorum ... adiectae sunt Varronis et Senecae saturae similesque reliquiae*, Berlin.
- Bürger, K. 1888. 'Zu Apuleius', *Hermes* 23, 489–498.
- 1892. 'Der Antike Roman vor Petronius', *Hermes* 27, 345–458.
- 1902. *Studien zur Geschichte des griechischen Romans I*, Blankenburg am Harz.
- 1903. *Studien zur Geschichte des griechischen Romans II*, Blankenburg am Harz.
- Burkert, W. 1985. *Greek Religion*, Cambridge, Mass.
- Burman, P. (ed.) 1665. *Titi Petronii Arbitri Satyricon Quae Supersunt*, 4 vols; revised by J. J. Reiske, Amsterdam.
- Burriss, E. E. 1941. 'Three Notes on the Text of the *Satyricon* of Petronius', *CP* 36, 274–276.
- 1947. 'Breaks in Conversation and the Text of Petronius', *CP* 42, 244–248.
- Calame, C. 1995. *The Craft of Poetic Speech in Ancient Greece* [orig. publ. in 1986 under the title *Le récit en Grèce ancienne*] (trans. J. Orion), Ithaca – London.

- Callebat, L. 1974. 'Structures narratives et modes de représentation dans le *Satyricon* de Pétron', *REL* 52, 281–303.
- Cameron, A. 1970. 'Myth and Meaning: Some Modern Comparisons', *Latomus* 29, 397–425.
- Canali, L. 1986. *L'erotico e il grottesco nel Satyricon*, Rome.
- Caplan, H. (ed.) 1977 [1954]. [*Cicero*] *ad C. Herennium*, Cambridge, Mass.
- Casaubon, Isaac. 1605. *De Satyrica Graecorum Poesi & Romanorum Satira*, Paris. [Repr. New York 1973].
- Cèbe, Jean-Pierre (ed.) 1972–1999. *Varron, Satires ménippées* (Collections de l'École Française de Rome 9), 13 vols., Rome.
- Cerutti, S. M., and L. Richardson. 1989. 'The *retiarius tunicatus* of Suetonius, Juvenal, and Petronius', *AJP* 110, 589–594.
- Ciaffi, V. 1955a. *Struttura del Satyricon*, Turin.
- 1955a. 'Intermezzo nella «Cena» Petroniana', *RFIC* 83, 113–145.
- 1960. *Petronio in Apuleio*, Turin.
- 1963. *Fulgenzio e Petronio*, Turin.
- Cichorius, C. 1922. *Römische Studien*, Leipzig – Berlin.
- Clerc, M. 1927–29 (repr. 1971). *Massalia, histoire de Marseille dans l'antiquité*. 2 vols., Marseille.
- Cocchia, E. 1893. 'Un romanzo di costumi nell' antichità: Il *Satyricon* di Petronio Arbitrio, Prima Parte', *NA* n.s. 45 (128), 435–460; 'Parte Seconda ed Ultima', 657–687.
- 1897. 'La satira e la parodia nel *Satyricon* di Petronio Arbitrio studiate in rapporto coll' ambiente storico in cui visse l'autore', *RFIC* 25, 353–428.
- Coccia, M. 1973. *Le interpolazioni in Petronio*, Rome.
- Coffey, M. 1976 (2nd edn. 1989). *Roman Satire*, Bristol.
- Coleman, K. 1990. 'Fatal Charades: Roman Executions Staged as Mythological Enactments', *JRS* 80, 44–73.
- Colin, J. 1952–1953. 'Juvénal, les baladins et les rétiaires d'après le manuscrit d'Oxford (Juv., *Sat.*, 365, 1–26)', *AAST. Classe di scienze morali, storiche e filologiche* 87, 315–386.
- Colli, G. and M. Montinari. 1970. *Nietzsche Werke: Kritische Gesamtausgabe*, Berlin.
- Collignon, A. 1892. *Étude sur Pétrone*, Paris.
- Connors, C. 1994. 'Famous Last Words: Authorship and Death in the *Satyricon* and Neronian Rome', in Elsner and Masters (eds.), 225–35.
- 1998. *Petronius the Poet: Verse and Literary Tradition in the Satyricon*, Cambridge.
- Conte, G. B. 1986. *The Rhetoric of Imitation: Genre and Poetic Memory in Virgil and Other Latin Poets* (trans. C. Segal), Ithaca – London.
- 1991. *Generi e lettori: Lucrezio, l'elegia d'amore, l'enciclopedia di Plinio*, Milano.
- 1992. 'Petronio, *Sat.* 141: una Congettura e un' Interpretazione', *RFIC* 120, 300–312.
- 1996. *The Hidden Author: An Interpretation of Petronius's Satyricon*, Berkeley.
- Corbett, P. B. 1970. *Petronius*, New York.
- Courtney, E. 1962. 'Parody and literary allusion in Menippean Satire', *Philologus* 106, 86–100.
- 1987. 'Petronius and the underworld', *AJP* 108, 408–410.
- 1988. 'Theocritus, Vergil, and Petronius', *AJP* 109, 349–350.
- (ed.) 1991. *The poems of Petronius*, Atlanta.
- 2001. *A Companion to Petronius*, Oxford — New York.
- Dalzell, A. 1955. 'C. Asinius Pollio and the early history of public recitation at Rome', *Hermathena* 86, 20–28.

- Daviault, A. 1983. 'La Destination d'Encolpe et la Structure du *Satiricon*: Conjectures', *Cahiers des Études anciennes* 15, 29–46.
- della Corte, M. 1954. *Case ed abitanti di Pompei*, Pompei.
- Dell'Era, A. 1970. *Problemi di lingua e stile in Petronio*, Rome.
- Di Simone, Marina. 1993. 'I fallimenti di Encolpio, tra esemplarità mitica e modelli letterari: una ricostruzione', *MD* 30, 87–108.
- Dietze, J. 1900. 'Zum Märchen von Amor und Psyche', *Philologus* 59, 136–147.
- Dihle, A. 1978. 'Zur Datierung des Metiochos-Roman', *WJA* 4, 47–55.
- Döpp, S. (ed.) 1993. *Karnevalische Phänomene in antiken und nachantiken Kulturen und Literaturen* (Stätten und Formen der Kommunikation im Altertum I. Bochumer Altertumswissenschaftliches Colloquium 13), Trier.
- Dover, K. J. 1978. *Greek Homosexuality*, London.
- Dowden, K. 1982. 'Apuleius and the Art of Narration', *CQ* 32, 419–435.
- Drennan, W. R. 1989. "'I Know Old Niceros and He's no Liar": Nick Carraway's name in *The Great Gatsby*', *ANQ* n.s. 2, 145–146.
- Dronke, P. 1994. *Verses with Prose from Petronius to Dante: The Art and Scope of the Mixed Form*, Cambridge, Mass. – London.
- Dudley, D. R. 1937 (4th edn. 1980). *A History of Cynicism, From Diogenes to the 6th Century A.D.*, Chicago.
- Edwards, C. 1993. *The Politics of Immorality*, Cambridge.
- Effe, B. 1975. 'Entstehung und Funktion "personaler" Erzählweisen in der Erzählliteratur der Antike', *Poetica* 7, 135–157.
- 1987. 'Der griechische Liebesroman und die Homoerotik', *Philologus* 131, 95–108.
- Ehlers, W. 1990. 'Zur Rezitation der Satiren des Persius', in Vogt-Spira (ed.), 171–182.
- Elsner, J., and J. Masters (eds.) 1994. *Reflections of Nero*, Chapel Hill – London.
- Eriksen, R. (ed.) 1994. *Contexts of Pre-Novel Narrative: The European Tradition*, Berlin – New York.
- Ernout, A. (ed.) 1923 (3rd edn. 1962). *Le Satyricon*, Paris.
- Faraone, C. 1990. 'Encolpius' Impotence and the Double Dose of *Satyrion*', in Tatum and Vernazza (eds.), 114–116.
- Fedeli, P. 1981a. 'Il tema del labirinto nel Satyricon di Petronio', *MCSN* 3, 161–174.
- 1981b. 'Petronio: il viaggio, il labirinto', *MD* 6, 91–117.
- Fichte, Johann Gottlieb. 1807–8. *Reden an die deutsche Nation*, Berlin.
- Fish, S. 1980. *Is There a Text in this Class: The Authority of Interpretive Communities*, Cambridge, Mass. – London.
- 1989. *Doing What Comes Naturally: Change, Rhetoric, and the Practice of Theory in Literary and Legal Studies*, Durham – London.
- Fisher, A. 1993. 'The project of humanism and Valla's imperial metaphor', *JMRS* 23, 301–22.
- Forcione, Alban K. 1970. *Cervantes, Aristotle and the Persiles*, Princeton.
- Fowler, A. 1982. *Kinds of Literature: An Introduction to the Theory of Genres and Modes*, Oxford.
- Freudenburg, K. 1990. 'Horace's Satiric Program and the Language of Contemporary Theory in *Satires* 2.1', *AJP* 111, 187–203.
- 1993. *The Walking Muse. Horace on the Theory of Satire*, Princeton.
- Friedländer, L. (ed.) 1891. *Petronii Cena Trimalchionis*, Leipzig.
- Frye, N. 1957. *Anatomy of Criticism: Four Essays*, Princeton.
- 1976. *The Secular Scripture: A Study of the Structure of Romance*. Cambridge, Mass.
- Funaioli, G. 1914. 'Recitationes', *RE* I A. 1, 435–446.

- Fusillo, M. 1989. *Il Romanzo Greco*, Venice.
- Gaselee, S. (ed.) 1915. *Cena Trimalchionis*, Cambridge.
- Genette, G. 1970. *Narrative Discourse: An Essay in Method* (trans. J. E. Lewin), Ithaca.
- 1988. *Narrative Discourse Revisited* (trans. J. E. Lewin), Ithaca.
- 1992. *The Architext: An Introduction* (trans. J. E. Lewin), Berkeley, Los Angeles – Oxford.
- 1993. *Fiction & Diction* (trans. C. Porter), Ithaca – London.
- 1997 [1982]. *Palimpsests: Literature in the Second Degree* (trans. C. Newman and C. Doubinsky), Lincoln – London.
- George, P. 1966. 'Style and Character in the *Satyricon*', *Arion* 5, 336–358.
- Giangrande, L. 1972. *The Use of Spoudaiogeloion in Greek and Roman Literature* (Studies in Classical Literature 6), The Hague.
- Giardina, G. 1994. 'Sulla nazionalità dei personaggi del *Satyricon*', *MCr* 29, 255–258.
- Gill, C. 1973. 'The sexual episodes in the *Satyricon*', *CP* 68, 172–185.
- 1979. 'Plato's Atlantis story and the birth of fiction', *Philosophy and Literature* 3, 64–78.
- (ed.) 1990. *The Person and the Human Mind: Issues in Ancient and Modern Philosophy*, Oxford.
- 1996. *Personality in Greek Epic, Tragedy, and Philosophy: The Self in Dialogue*, Oxford.
- Gill, C., and T. P. Wiseman (eds.) 1993. *Lies and Fiction in the Ancient World*, Austin.
- Gowers, E. 1993. *The Loaded Table. Representations of Food in Roman Literature*, Oxford.
- Grimal, P. 1977. *La guerre civile de Petrone dans ses rapports avec la Pharsale*, Paris.
- Hägg, T. 1971. *Narrative Technique in Ancient Greek Romances: Studies of Chariton, Xenophon Ephesius and Achilles Tatius*, Stockholm.
- 1980. *Den antike Romanen*, Uppsala.
- 1983. *The Novel in Antiquity*, Oxford.
- 1984. 'The Parthenope Romance Decapitated?' *Symbolae Osloenses* 59, 61–92.
- 1985. 'Metiochus at Polycrates' Court', *Eranos* 83, 92–102.
- 1994. 'Orality, Literacy, and the "Readership" of the Early Greek Novel', in Eriksen (ed.), 47–81.
- Haight, E. H. 1953. 'Notes on Recent Publications about the Ancient Novel', *CW* 46, 233–236.
- Halperin, D. M. 1990. *One Hundred Years of Homosexuality*, New York – London.
- Hamburger, K. 1973 (2nd edn. 1993). *The Logic of Literature* (trans. M. J. Rose), Bloomington – Indianapolis.
- Hanson, J. A. (ed.) 1989. *Apuleius: Metamorphoses*, 2 vols., Cambridge, Mass.
- Harlow, R. B. 1974. 'Pharmace, Petronius 107.15', *Hermes* 102, 377.
- Harrison, S. J. 1990a. 'The Speaking Book: The Prologue to Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*', *CQ* n.s. 40, 507–513.
- 1990b. 'Some Odyssean Scenes in Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*', *MD* 25, 193–201.
- 1998. 'The Milesian Tales and the Roman Novel', *Groningen Colloquia on the Novel* 9, 61–73.
- (ed.) 1999. *Oxford Readings in the Roman Novel*, Oxford.
- 2002. 'Constructing Apuleius: The Emergence of a Literary Artist', *AN* 2, 143–171.
- Haslam, M. W. 1981. 'Narrative about Tinouphis in Prosimetrum (P. Hauniensis inv. 400)', in *Papyri Greek and Egyptian, Edited by Various Hands in Honour of Eric Gardner Turner on the Occasion of his Seventieth Birthday (P. Turner)* (Egyptian Exploration Society. Graeco-Roman Memoirs 68), 35–45, London.

- Heinse [Heinsius], W. (trans.) 1773. (often repr.) *Begebenheiten des Enkolp. Aus dem Satyricon des Petron übersetzt*, 2 vols., Rome.
- Heinze, R. 1899. 'Petronius und der griechische Roman', *Hermes* 34, 494–519.
- 1915. *Virgils epische Technik*, Leipzig.
- Helm, R. 1956. 'Nachaugusteische nichtchristliche Dichter' / 'Petronius', *Lustrum* 1, 229–236.
- (ed.) 1972. *Apuleius: Apologia (De Magia)*, Leipzig.
- (ed.) 1992. *Apuleius: Metamorphoseon libri XI*, Leipzig.
- (ed.) 1993. *Apuleius: Florida*, Leipzig.
- Henderson, J. 1991. *The Maculate Muse. Obscene Language in Attic Comedy*, New York.
- Henriksson, K.-E. 1956. *Griechische Büchertitel in der Römischen Literatur* (Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia / Annales Academiae Scientiarum Fennicae Ser. B, Tom. 102, 1), Helsinki.
- Hercher, R. 1873 (repr. 1965). *Epistolographi Graeci*, Amsterdam.
- Heseltine, M. (trans.) 1987. *Petronius*, Cambridge, Mass. – London.
- Hight, G. 1941. 'Petronius the moralist', *TAPA* 72, 176–194.
- 1951. 'Juvenal's bookcase', *AJP* 72, 369–394.
- 1967. 'Masks and faces in satire', *Hermes* 102, 321–337.
- Hijmans Jr., B. L., and R. T. van der Paardt (eds.) 1978. *Aspects of Apuleius*' Golden Ass, Groningen.
- Hinds, S. 1998. *Allusion and Intertext: Dynamics of Appropriation in Roman Poetry*, Cambridge.
- Hirschfeld, O. 1896. 'Petronius und Lucianus', *RhM* 51, 470–471.
- Hodge, A. Trevor. 1998. *Ancient Greek France*, London.
- Hoffmann, Heinz. (ed.) 1999. *Latin Fiction: The Latin Novel in Context*, London – New York.
- Holquist, M. 1990. *Dialogism: Bakhtin and his World*, London – New York.
- Holzberg, N. 1993. 'A Lesser Known "Picaresque" Novel of Greek Origin: The *Aesop Romance* and Its Influence', *Groningen Colloquia on the Novel* 5, 1–16.
- 1995. *The Ancient Novel: An Introduction*, London – New York.
- Horsfall, N. M. 1989. 'Petronius' *Cena* and the Uses of Literacy', *G&R* 36, 74–89 and 194–209.
- 1991–92. "'Generic Composition" and Petronius' *Satyricon*', *SCI* 11, 123–138.
- Hubbard, T. K. 1986. 'The Narrative Architecture of Petronius' *Satyricon*', *AC* 55, 190–212.
- Jensson, G. 1997. *The Recollections of Encolpius: A Reading of the Satyrca as Greco-Roman Erotic Fiction* (Ph.D. diss., Toronto).
- 1998. Review of Conte 1996. *Phoenix* Vol. LII No. 1–2, 165–167.
- 1999. Review of Connors 1998. *Scholia* 8, 152–156.
- 2001. Review of Plaza 2000. *Bryn Mawr Classical Review* 2001.09.26.
- 2002. 'The *Satyrca* of Petronius as a Roman Palimpsest', *AN* 2, 86–122.
- Jones, C. P. 1980. 'Apuleius' *Metamorphoses* and Lollianos' *Phoinikika*', *Phoenix* 34, 243–254.
- 1986. *Culture and Society in Lucian*, Cambridge, Mass. – London.
- 1991. 'Dinner Theatre', in Slater (ed.), 185–198.
- Jones, F. 1987. 'The Narrator and the Narrative of the *Satyricon*', *Latomus* 46, 810–819.
- 1991. 'Realism in Petronius', *Groningen Colloquia on the Novel* 4, 105–120.
- Kaster, R. A. 1988. *The Guardians of Language: The Grammarian and Society in Late Antiquity*, Berkeley.
- Kehoe, P. H. 1984. 'The Adultery Mime Reconsidered', in Bright and Ramage (eds.), 89–106.

- Kennedy, G. A. 1978. 'Encolpius and Agamemnon in Petronius', *AJP* 99, 171–178.
- (ed.) 1989. *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism*, Cambridge.
- 1994. *A New History of Classical Rhetoric*, Princeton.
- Kenney, E. J. (ed.) 1990. *Apuleius: Cupid & Psyche*, Cambridge.
- Kershaw, A. 1981. 'The Forms of Some Greek Names in the *Satyricon*', *PSN* 11.1 & 2 / 12.1, 4.
- 1991. 'In Defense of Petronius 119, verses 30–32', *AJP* 112, 262.
- Killeen, J. F. 1957. 'James Joyce's Roman Prototype', *Comparative Literature* 9, 193–203.
- 1969. 'Petronius 9.8', *Hermes* 97, 127–128.
- Kirk, E. P. 1980. *Menippean Satire: An Annotated Catalogue of Texts and Criticism*, New York – London.
- Kißel, W. 1978. 'Petrons Kritik der Rhetorik (Sat. 1–5)', *RhM* 121, 311–328.
- Klebs, E. 1889. 'Zur Composition von Petronius *Satirae*', *Philologus* 47, 623–635.
- Kleinfeller, G. 1958. 'Exilium', *RE* VI. 2, 1683–1685.
- Knight, C. A. 1989. 'Listening to Encolpius: Modes of Confusion in the *Satyricon*', *UTQ* 58, 335–354.
- Knox, B. M. W. 1968. 'Silent Reading in Antiquity', *GRBS* 9, 421–435.
- Konstan, D. 1994. *Sexual Symmetry: Love in the Ancient Novel and Related Genres*, Princeton.
- Korn, M. and S. Reitzer. 1986. *Concordantia Petroniana: Computerkonkordanz zu den Satyrica des Petron*, Hildesheim – Zürich – New York.
- Korus, K. 1990. 'Zur Theorie der menippeischen Satire', *Eos* 78, 119–131.
- Koster, S. 1970. *Antike Epistheorien*, Wiesbaden.
- Kragelund, P. 1989. 'Epicurus, Priapus and the Dreams in Petronius', *CQ* 39, 436–450.
- Leeman, A. D. 1967. 'Morte e scambio nel romanzo picaresco di Petronio', *GIF* 20, 147–157.
- Lefèvre, E. 1990. 'Die römische Literatur zwischen Mündlichkeit und Schriftlichkeit', in Vogt-Spira. (ed.), 9–15.
- Laird, A. 1990. 'Person, *persona* and representation in Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*', *MD* 25, 129–164.
- Leiwo, M. 1994. *Neopolitana. A study of Population and Language in Graeco-Roman Naples* (Commentationes Humanarum Litterarum 102), Helsinki.
- Lejeune, P. 1989. *On Biography* (trans. K. Leary), Minneapolis.
- LeMoine, F. J. 1991. 'Parental Gifts: Father-Son Dedications and Dialogues in Roman Didactic Literature', *ICS* 16, 337–366.
- Lindberg, B. 1993. *Europa och latinet*, Stockholm.
- Loporcaro, M. 1992. 'Eroi screditati dal testo: strutture della parodia nelle storie di briganti in Apuleio *Met.* IV. 9–21', *Maia* 44, 65–78.
- Lucas, H. 1907. 'Zu den Milesiaca des Aristides', *Philologus* 66, 16–35.
- Lukács, G. 1971. *The Theory of the Novel*, Cambridge, Mass.
- Maass, E. 1925. 'Eunuchos und Verwandtes', *RhM* 74, 432–476.
- MacDermott, M. H. 1983. 'The *Satyricon* as Parody of the *Odyssey* and Greek Romance', *LCM* 8, 82–85.
- Macmullen, R. 1988. *Corruption and the Decline of Rome*, New Haven – London.
- Maiuri, A. 1945. *La Cena di Trimalchione*, Naples.
- Malherbe, J. A. 1977 (repr. 1986). *The Cynic Epistles*, Atlanta, Georgia.
- Marblestone, H. 1985. 'Syrus in Tiberim defluxit Orontes', *Mnemosyne* 38, 156–157.
- Marmorale, E. V. 1936. *Petronio*, Naples.

- Marsh, D. 1979. 'Grammar, Method and Polemic in Lorenzo Valla's *Elegantiae*', *Rinascimento* 19, 91–116.
- Martin, R. 1975. 'Quelques remarques concernant la date du *Satiricon*', *REL* 53, 182–224.
- Mason, H. J. 1978. 'Fabula Graecanica: Apuleius and his Greek Sources', in Hijmans and Van der Paardt (eds.), 1–15.
- 1983. 'The Distinction of Lucius in Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*', *Phoenix* 37, 135–143.
- 1994. 'Greek and Latin Versions of the Ass-Story', *ANRW* II, 34. 2, 1665–1707.
- Mau, G. 1907. 'Ergastulum', *RE* VI. 1, 431.
- Maxwell, L. R. 1993. *The Documentary Evidence for Ancient Mime* (Ph.D. diss., Toronto).
- McMahon, John M. 1998. *Paralysin Cave: Impotence, Perception, and Text in the Satyricon of Petronius*, Leiden.
- Mommsen, Th. 1854. *Römische Geschichte*, Berlin.
- 1868. *The history of Rome* (translated with the author's sanction and additions by William P. Dickson, with a preface by Leonard Schmitz), New York.
- 1878. 'Trimalchios Heimath und Grabschrift', *Hermes* 13, 106–121.
- Montague, H. 1992. 'Sweet and Pleasant Passion: Female and Male Fantasy in Ancient Romance Novels', in Richlin (ed.), 231–249.
- Morgan, J. R. 1996. 'Heliodoros', in Schmeling (ed.), 415–456.
- Morgan, J. R., and R. Stoneman (eds.) 1994. *Greek Fiction: The Greek Novel in Context*, London – New York.
- Möring, F. 1915. *De Petronio Mimorum Imitatore* (diss., Münster).
- Most, G. W. 1989. 'The Stranger's Stratagem: Self-Disclosure and Self-Sufficiency in Greek Culture', *JHS* 109, 114–133.
- Müller, K. (ed.) 1961. *Petronii Arbitri Satyricon*, Munich.
- Müller, K. (ed.) 1995. *Petronii Arbitri Satyricon reliquiae*, Leipzig.
- Müller, K. (ed.) and W. Ehlers (trans.) 1965. *Petronius Satyricon: Schelmengeschichten*, Munich.
- Müller, K. (ed.) and Ehlers, W. (trans.) 1983. *Petronius Satyricon: Schelmenszenen*, Munich.
- Mulroy, David D. 1970. 'Petronius 81.3', *CP* 65, 254–256.
- Muth, R. 1956. 'Der Forschungsbericht: Petronius 1941–1955', *AAHG* 9, 1–22.
- Nagy, G. 1989. 'Early Greek Views of Poets and Poetry', in Kennedy (ed.), 1–69.
- Neumann, E. 1956. *Amor and Psyche: The Psychic Development of the Feminine* (trans. R. Manheim), Princeton.
- Navia, L. E. 1995. *The Philosophy of Cynicism: An Annotated Bibliography*, Westport, Connecticut – London.
- Newton, Rick M. 1992. 'Bacalusias: A Transitional Hapax in Petronius Satyricon 41.2.', *CP* 87, 246–249.
- Nicoll, A. 1963. *Masks, Mimes and Miracles. Studies in the Popular Theatre*, New York.
- Nietzsche, F. 1870. *Beiträge zur Quellenkunde und Kritik des Laertius Diogenes*, Basel.
- Norden, E. 1898 (2nd. edn. 1909). *Antike Kunstprosa*, 2 vols., Leipzig.
- Nussbaum, M. C. 1986. *The Fragility of Goodness: Luck and Ethics in Greek Tragedy and Philosophy*, Cambridge – New York – Oakleigh.
- Otto, A. 1890. *Die Sprichwörter und sprichwörterlichen Redensarten der Römer*, Leipzig.
- Pack, R. 1960. 'The Criminal Dossier of Encolpius', *CP* 55, 31–32.
- Panayotakis, C. 1994a. 'Quartilla's Histrionics in Petronius, *Satyricon* 16.1–26.6', *Mnemosyne* 47, 319–336.
- 1994b. 'Theatrical Elements in the Episode on Board Lichas' Ship', *Mnemosyne* 47, 596–624.

- 1994c. 'A Sacred Ceremony in Honor of the Buttocks: Petronius, *Satyricon* 140.1–11', *CQ* 44, 458–467.
- 1995. *Theatrum Arbitri: Theatrical Elements in the Satyrica of Petronius*, New York.
- Paratore, E. (ed.) 1933. *Il Satyricon di Petronio*, Florence.
- Parker, H. N. 1994. 'A Curiously Persistent Error: *Satyricon* 43.4.' *CP* 89, 162–166.
- Parsons, P. J. 1971. 'A Greek Satyricon?', *BICS* 8, 53–68.
- 1974. 'Narrative about Iolaus', *POxy* 42 (no. 3010), 34–41.
- Pellegrino, Carlo (ed.) 1975. *Petronii Arbitri Satyricon*, Rome.
- 1986. *Satyricon*. Vol. I. *I capitoli della retorica*, Rome.
- Perrochat, P. (ed.) 1939 (2nd edn. 1952). *Pétrone. Le festin de Trimalcion*, Paris.
- Perry, B. E. 1925. 'Petronius and the Comic Romance', *CP* 20, 31–49.
- 1967. *The Ancient Romances. A Literary-Historical Account of Their Origins*, Berkeley – Los Angeles.
- Perutelli, A. 1985. 'Le chiacchiere dei liberti: dialogo e commedia in Petronio 41–46', *Maia* 37, 103–119.
- 1990. 'Il narratore nel Satyricon', *MD* 25, 9–26.
- Petersmann, H. 1977. *Petrone's urbane Prosa: Untersuchungen zu Sprache und Text (Syntax)* (Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, philosophisch-historische Klasse, Sitzungsberichte 323), Vienna.
- 1985. 'Umwelt, Sprachsituation und Stilschichten in Petrons *Satyrica*', *ANRW* II. 32. 3, 1687–1705.
- 1986. 'Der Begriff "Satyra" und die Entstehung der Gattung', in Adamietz (ed.), 7–24.
- 2000. 'Antike Unterhaltungsliteratur zwischen Roman und Satire: Petrons *Satyrica*, das *Iolaos*- und das *Tinouphis*fragment', *AAnthung* 40.1/4, 371–379.
- Pfister, F. 1933. 'Isokrates und die spätere Gliederung der Narratio', *Hermes* 68, 457–460.
- Philipp, H. 1930. 'Massalia', *RE* XIV. 2, 2130–2153.
- Plaza, M. 2000. *Laughter and Derision in Petronius' Satyrica: A Literary Study*, Stockholm.
- Prince, G. 1987. *A Dictionary of Narratology*, Lincoln – London.
- Puccioni, G. 1972. 'Libera cena in Petronio', *GIF* n.s. 3, 323–326.
- Quinn, K. 1982. 'The Poet and His Audience in the Augustan Age', *ANRW* II. 30. 1, 76–180.
- Rankin, H. D. 1971. *Petronius the Artist*, The Hague.
- Reardon, B. P. (ed.) 1989. *Collected Ancient Greek Novels*, Berkeley, Los Angeles – London.
- 1983. 'Petronius', in Reynolds (ed.), 295–300.
- 1991. *The Form of Greek Romance*, Princeton.
- 1994. 'Achilles Tatius and Ego-Narrative', in Morgan and Stoneman (eds.), 80–96.
- Reed, J. D. 1997. 'Ovid's Elegy on Tibullus and Its Models', *CP* 92:3, 260–268.
- Reith, O. 1963. *Petronius ein Epikureer*, Nürnberg.
- Reitzenstein, R. 1906 (2. edn. 1963). *Hellenistische Wundererzählungen*, Leipzig.
- Relihan, J. C. 1984. 'On the Origin of "Menippean Satire" as the Name of a Literary Genre', *CP* 79, 226–229.
- 1992. 'The Novel in the Classroom. Teaching the Ancient Romance', *PSN* 22, 7–9.
- 1993. *Ancient Menippean Satire*, Baltimore – London.
- Reynolds, L. D. (ed.) 1983. *Texts and Transmission: A Survey of the Latin Classics*, Oxford.
- Ribbeck, O. 1892. *Römische Dichtung*, 3 vols., Stuttgart.
- Ribezzo, F. 1930. 'A Petron. *Sat.* 104 (Bais ter asylo notaveram)', *RIGI* 14, 57–58.
- Rich, J. and G. Shipley (eds.) 1993. *War and Society in the Roman World*, London – New York.

- Richardson, T. W. 1975. 'Problems in the Text-History of Petronius in Antiquity and the Middle Ages', *AJP* 96, 290–305.
- 1993. *Reading and Variant in Petronius: Studies in the French Humanists and Their Manuscript Sources* (Phoenix Supplement 32), Toronto.
- Richlin, A. 1983 (rev. edn. 1992), *The Garden of Priapus: Sexuality & Aggression in Roman Humor*, New York – Oxford.
- (ed.) 1992. *Pornography and Representation in Greece and Rome*, New York – Oxford.
- Rimell, V. 2002. *Petronius and the Anatomy of Fiction*, Cambridge.
- Robert, C. (ed.) 1890. *Aus der Anomia*, Berlin.
- Rohde, E. 1876 (3rd edn. 1913, repr. 1960). *Der griechische Roman und seine Vorläufer*, Leipzig.
- 1885. 'Zu Apuleius', *RhM* 40, 66–91.
- 1893. 'Zum griechischen Roman', *RhM* 48, 110–140.
- Romberg, B. 1962. *Studies in the Narrative Technique of the First-Person Novel*, Stockholm – Gothenburg – Uppsala.
- Romm, J. S. 1992. *The Edges of the Earth in Ancient Thought*, Princeton.
- Rose, K. F. C. 1962. 'Time and Place in the *Satyricon*', *TAPA* 93, 402–409.
- 1966. 'The Petronian Inquisition: An Auto-da-Fé', *Arion* 5, 275–301.
- 1971. *The Date and Author of the Satyricon* (Mnemosyne Supplement 16), Leiden.
- Rose, M. A. 1993. *Parody: Ancient, Modern, and Post-Modern*, Cambridge.
- Rosenblüth, M. 1909. *Beiträge zur Quellenkunde von Petrons Satiren*, Berlin.
- Rowland, R. J. 1969. 'The Significance of Massilia in Lucan', *Hermes* 97, 204–208.
- Ruiz-Montero, C. 1996. 'The Rise of the Greek Novel', in Schmeling (ed.), 29–85.
- Russel, D. A. (ed.) 1990. *Antonine Literature*, Oxford.
- Sage, E. T. (ed.) 1929. *Petronius: The Satyricon*, New York.
- Salonius, A. H. 1927. *Die Griechen und das griechische in Petrons Cena Trimalchionis* (Societas Scientiarum Fennica, Commentationes Humanarum Litterarum II. 1), Helsinki.
- Sandy, G. N. 1969. 'Satire in the *Satyricon*', *AJP* 90, 293–303.
- 1970. 'Petronius and the Tradition of Interpolated Narrative', *TAPA* 101, 463–476.
- 1974a. 'Recent Scholarship on the Prose Fiction of Classical Antiquity', *CW* 67, 321–359.
- 1974b. 'Scaenica Petroniana', *TAPA* 104, 329–346.
- 1976. 'Publilius Syrus and *Satyricon* 55.5–6', *RhM* 119, 286–287.
- 1979. 'Notes on Lollianos's *Phoenicica*', *AJP* 100, 367–376.
- 1994a. 'New Pages of Greek Fiction', in Morgan and Stonemann (eds.), 130–145.
- 1994b. 'Apuleius' *Metamorphoses* and the Greek Novel', *ANRW* II. 34.2, 1511–1574.
- 1997. *The Greek World of Apuleius: Apuleius and the Second Sophistic* (Mnemosyne Supplement 174), Leiden.
- Schlam, C. C. 1971. 'The Scholarship on Apuleius since 1938', *CW* 64, 285–309.
- 1976. *Apuleius and the Monuments*, University Park, Pa.
- Schmeling, G. L. 1969a. 'Petronian Scholarship since 1957', *CW* 62, 157–164; 352–353.
- 1969b. 'The Literary Use of Names in Petronius' *Satyricon*', *RSC* 17, 5–10.
- 1971. 'The *Satyricon*. Forms in Search of a Genre', *CB* 47, 49–53.
- 1992a. 'The *Satyricon*: The Sense of an Ending', *RhM* 134, 352–377.
- 1992b. 'Petronius 14.3: Shekels and Lupines. *Mnemosyne* 45, 531–536.
- 1994. '*Quid attinet veritatem per interpretem quaerere? Interpretes and the Satyricon*', *Ramus* 23, 144–168.
- 1994/5. 'Confessor Gloriosus: a Role of Encolpius in the *Satyricon*', *WJA* 20, 207–224.

- (ed.) 1996a. *The Novel in the Ancient World*, Leiden – New York – Cologne.
- 1996b. ‘The *Satyricon* of Petronius’, in Schmeling (ed.) 1996, 457–490.
- Schmeling, G. L., and J. Stuckey. 1977. *A Bibliography of Petronius* (Mnemosyne Supplement 39), Leiden.
- Schmid, G. 1904. ‘Der griechische Roman’, *NJKAP* 7, 465–485.
- Schnur, H. C. 1957. ‘Recent Petronian Scholarship’, *CW* 50, 133–136; 141–143.
- Scholes, R., and R. Kellogg. 1966. *The Nature of Narrative*, New York – Oxford.
- Scobie, A. 1969. *Aspects of the Ancient Romance*, Meisenheim am Glan.
- Sedgwick, W. (ed.) 1925. *The Cena Trimalchionis of Petronius*, Oxford.
- Segebade, J. and E. Lommatzsch. (eds.) 1962. *Lexicon Petronianum*, Hildesheim.
- Sergent, B. 1986. *Homosexuality in Greek Myth* (trans. A. Goldhammer) [orig. title: *L’Homosexualité dans la mythologie grecque* 1984], Boston.
- Sgobbo, I. 1930. ‘Frammenti del libro XIV delle *Saturae* di Petronio’, *RAL* ser. 6, vol. 6, 354–361.
- Shey, H. James. 1971. ‘Petronius and Plato’s *Gorgias*’, *CB* 47, 81–84.
- Sinclair, B. W. 1984. ‘Encolpius and Asianism (*Satyricon* 2.7)’, in Bright and Ramage (eds.), 231–237.
- Slater, N. W. 1990. *Reading Petronius*, Baltimore.
- 1994. ‘From *harena* to *Cena*: Trimalchio’s *capis* (*Sat.* 52.1–3)’, *CQ* 44, 549–550.
- Slater, W. J. (ed.) 1991. *Dining in the Classical Context*, Michigan.
- Smith, B. H. 1968. *Poetic Closure: A Study of How Poems End*, Chicago – London.
- 1978. *On the Margins of Discourse: The Relation of Literature to Language*, Chicago – London.
- Smith, M. S. (ed.) 1975. *Petronius: Cena Trimalchionis*, Oxford.
- 1985. ‘Petronius: a Bibliography 1945–82’, *ANRW* II. 32. 3, 1624–1665.
- Smith Jr., W. S. 1972. ‘The Narrative Voice in Apuleius’, *TAPA* 103, 513–534.
- Sollors, W. (ed.) 1993. *The Return of Thematic Criticism*, Cambridge, Mass. – London.
- Soverini, P. 1976. ‘Le perversioni di Encolpio (per una nuova possibilità di Petr. 9,8s.)’, *MCSN* 1, 97–107.
- 1985. ‘Il problema delle teorie retoriche e poetiche di Petronio’, *ANRW* II. 32. 3, 1706–1779.
- Stanzel, F. K. 1965. *Typische Formen des Romans*, Göttingen.
- Starr, R. J. 1987a. ‘Trimalchio’s *Homeristae*’, *Latomus* 46, 199–200.
- 1987b. ‘Trimalchio’s Libraries’, *Hermes* 115, 252–253.
- 1987c. ‘The Circulation of Literary Texts in the Roman World’ *CQ* 37, 213–223.
- 1991. ‘Reading Aloud: *Lectores* and Roman Reading’, *CJ* 86, 337–343.
- Stefenelli, A. 1962. *Die Volkssprache im Werk des Petron im Hinblick auf die romanischen Sprachen*, Vienna.
- Stephens, S. A. and J. J. Winkler. 1995. *Ancient Greek Novels: The Fragments*, Princeton.
- Stolz, Walter. 1987. *Petrone Satyricon und François Nodot. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte literarischer Fälschungen*, Stuttgart.
- Stubbe, H. 1933. *Die Verseinlagen im Petron* (Philologus Supplement 25: 2), Leipzig.
- Studer, G. 1843. ‘Über das Zeitalter des Petronius Arbitr’, *RhM* 2, 50–92; 202–223.
- Suerbaum, W. 1968. ‘Die Ich-Erzählungen des Odysseus: Überlegungen zur epischen Technik der Odyssee’, *Poetica* 2, 150–177.
- Sullivan, J. P. 1968. *The Satyricon of Petronius*, London.
- 1971. ‘Petronius and his Modern Critics’, *Bucknell Review* 19, 107–124.
- 1976. ‘Interpolations in Petronius’, *PCPS* n.s. 22, 90–122.

- 1985a. *Literature and Politics in the Age of Nero*, Ithaca.
- 1985b. 'Petronius' 'Satyricon' and its Neronian Context', *ANRW* II. 32. 3, 1666–1686.
- 1986. *Petronius: The Satyricon*, Harmondsworth.
- 1990. 'The Relevance of Modern Critical Approaches to the Roman Novel', in Tatum and Vernazza (eds.), 91–97.
- Susemihl, F. 1892. 'Zum Roman der Alexandrinerzeit', *NJPhP* 38 [145], 752.
- Süß, W. [Suess, Guilelmus] 1926. 'De eo quem dicunt inesse Trimalchionis cenae sermone vulgari' (Acta et Commentationes Universitatis Tartuensis 11), Tartu.
- 1927. 'Petronii imitatio sermonis plebei qua necessitate coniungatur cum grammatica illius aetatis doctrina' (Acta et Commentationes Universitatis Tartuensis 13), Tartu.
- Svenbro, J. 1993. *Phrasikleia: An Anthropology of Reading in Ancient Greece* (trans. J. Lloyd), Ithaca – London.
- Swanson, Donald C. 1963. *A Formal Analysis of Petronius' Vocabulary*, Minneapolis.
- Syme, R. 1958. *Tacitus*, 2 vols., Oxford.
- Tanzer, H. 1939. *The Common People of Pompeii: A Study of the Graffiti*, Baltimore.
- Taplin, O. 1993. *Comic Angels*, Oxford.
- Tatum, J. (ed.) 1994. *The Search for the Ancient Novel. A selection of papers from the 1989 conference*, Baltimore.
- Tatum, J. and G. Vernazza (eds.) 1990. *The Ancient Novel. Classical Perspectives and Modern Paradigms. Proceedings of the (1989) International Conference on the Ancient Novel, Dartmouth, N.H.*, Hanover, N.H.
- Thiele, G. 1890. 'Zum griechischen Roman', in *Aus der Anomia: Archäologische Beiträge Carl Robert dargebracht*, 124–133, Berlin.
- 1893. 'Zum griechischen Roman', *NJPhP* 147, 403–408.
- Trahman, C. R. 1952. 'Odysseus' lies (*Odyssey*, books 13–19)', *Phoenix* 6, 31–42.
- Trimpi, W. 1983. *Muses of One Mind: A Literary Analysis of Experience and its Continuity*, Princeton.
- van der Paardt, R. Th. 1981. 'The unmasked 'I': Apuleius *Met.* XI.27', *Mnemosyne* 34, 96–106.
- van Rooy, C. A. 1965. *Studies in Classical Satire and Related Literary Theory*, Leiden.
- van Thiel, H. 1971. *Petron: Überlieferung und Rekonstruktion*, Leiden.
- Veyne, P. 1961. 'Le 'je' dans le Satiricon', *REL* 42, 301–24.
- Vidal-Naquet, P. 1986 (orig. French edn. 1981). *The Black Hunter* (trans. A. Szegedy-Maszak), Baltimore – London.
- Vilborg, E. (ed.) 1955. *Achilles Tatius*, Stockholm.
- 1962. *Achilles Tatius. A Commentary*, Stockholm.
- Vogt-Spira, G. (ed.) 1990. *Strukturen der Mündlichkeit in der römischen Literatur*, Tübingen.
- von Albrecht, Michael. 2003. *Literature als Brücke. Studien zur Rezeptionsgeschichte und Komparatistik* (Spudasmata 90), Hildesheim.
- von Korn, M. and S. Reitzer. 1986. *Concordantia Petroniana*, Berlin.
- von Wilamowitz-Möllendorff, U. 1876. 'Memoriae Oblitteratae', *Hermes* 11, 291–304.
- 1905. *Die griechische und lateinische Literatur und Sprache* (Die Kultur der Gegenwart. Teil I, Abt. 8), Berlin – Leipzig.
- Wackernagel, H. 1966. 'Massalia', *RE* XIV. 2, 2130–2153.
- Walcot, P. 1978. 'Odysseus and the Art of Lying', *AS* 8, 1–19.
- Walsh, P. G. 1968. 'Lucius Madaurensis', *Phoenix* 22, 148.
- 1970. *The Roman Novel*, Cambridge.
- 1974. 'Was Petronius a Moralist?', *G&R* 21, 181–190.

- 1978. 'Petronius and Apuleius', in Hijmans and van der Paardt (eds.), 17–24.
- Waters, W. E. (ed.) 1902. *Petronius. C(ena) T(rimalchionis)*, Boston.
- Whittick, G. C. 1957. 'Echion's Son and his Tutors: Petronius 46, 3–8', *RhM* 100, 392–393.
- Wilcken, U. 1893. 'Ein neuer griechischer Roman', *Hermes* 28, 161–193.
- Williams, C. A. 1999. *Roman Homosexuality: Ideologies of Masculinity in Classical Antiquity*, New York – Oxford.
- Williams, G. 1968. *Tradition and Originality in Roman Poetry*, Oxford.
- Winkler, J. J. 1980. 'Lollianus and the Desperadoes', *JHS* 100, 155–181.
- 1982. 'The Mendacity of Kalasiris and the Narrative Strategy of Heliodoros' *Aithiopika*', *YCS* 27, 93–158.
- 1985. *Auctor & Actor: A Narratological Reading of Apuleius's The Golden Ass*, Berkeley.
- Wooten, Cecil. 1976. 'Petronius, the Mime, and Rhetorical Education', *Helios* n.s. 3, 67–74.
- Wucher, A. 1956. *Theodor Mommsen. Geschichtschreibung und Politik*, Göttingen.
- Wylie, K. 1994. *Satyrical and Heroic Mimes: Attitude as the Way of the Mime in Ritual and Beyond*, Jefferson, N.C.
- Zagagi, N. 1988. 'Exilium amoris in New Comedy', *Hermes* 116, 193–209.
- Zeitlin, F. 1971a. 'Petronius as Paradox: Anarchy and Artistic Integrity', *TAPA* 102, 631–684.
- 1971b. 'Romanus Petronius', *Latomus* 30, 56–82.

Index

- Achilles Tatius, 44, 47, 88, 93, 96, 107, 123, 136, 148–149, 167, 197–198, 203, 267
- Adams, J. N., 139, 241, 287
- Aelius Aristides, 114, 299
- Aeneas, 93, 198
- Aesop, 240, 298
- Africa, 114, 171, 268
- Agamemnon, character in *Satyrica*, 7, 32, 48–50, 53, 57, 60, 73, 123, 126–129, 132, 135, 137, 139, 158, 179–181, 200, 211, 214–218, 220–223, 225–226, 236, 284–285
- amphitheater, 138–141, 143–144, 146, 148–150, 158–159, 178. *See* arena
- anagnorismos*. *See* recognition
- Anderson, G., 92, 100, 105
- Anthia, 44, 88, 107
- Anthologia Palatina*, 11
- antike Schmutz*, 205, 253. *See* pornography
- Antistius Labeo, 229–230, 280
- Anton, Conrad Gottlob, 9
- Antonius Diogenes, 114, 207, 274
- Apelles, 80–81, 227
- aphrodisiac, 105, 130, 167, 180, 186. *See* satyrion
- Aphrodite, 88, 106, 136, 264, 272
- Apollo, 107, 160, 170, 291
- Apollonius Rex, 88, 107
- Apuleius, 9, 15–16, 25, 44–45, 66, 73, 93, 95, 97, 99, 101, 121, 133–134, 157, 164, 195, 197, 203, 208–209, 242–243, 246, 253, 258–260, 262–263, 266–268, 271, 276, 278, 288, 290–291, 296–298, 300
- arena, 79, 140, 143, 145, 148, 151, 158, 172. *See* amphitheater
- aretalogi*, 74
- Aristophanes, 74, 109, 168, 236, 242, 252, 299
- Aristotle, 20, 30, 52, 80, 94, 167, 240–241
- Arrowsmith, W., 76, 209
- Ascyrtos, 9, 18, 41, 46, 49–50, 63, 79, 93, 96, 98, 105, 109, 119, 121–122, 126, 129, 131, 137–145, 147–148, 150–151, 153, 155–160, 164–165, 167–168, 170, 172, 178–181, 183, 186, 199–200, 210, 214–216, 223, 239, 281, 287, 292
- asellus*, 102, 131
- Ass-Stories, 23, 34, 44, 88, 131, 143, 171, 215, 243, 253, 260, 263, 266, 288
- Athenaeus, 131, 238, 298
- Auerbach, E., 212–213
- Augustine, 101
- Augustus, 74, 81, 111, 125, 127, 157, 292
- Austin, R. G., 50, 123
- autobiographical narrative, 22–23, 25, 27, 43, 101, 148, 207, 258. *See* *pacte autobiographique*
- Bacon, H. H., 209
- Bagnani, G., 105, 140, 142, 147–149
- Baiae, 116, 122, 124, 126, 152, 177
- baldness, 239–243, 254, 272
- Baldwin, B., 105
- barbarism, linguistic, 50, 60, 62, 65–66, 68–69
- Bargates, 63, 183, 218
- Barnes, E. J., 11
- Beck, Roger, 18, 22, 26, 55, 193–194, 197, 209–210, 246
- Bellum Civile*, 71–73, 112, 185, 204, 219–221, 233–235, 267
- Beloch, J., 122, 124, 127
- bilingualism, 284, 287–288, 290–291
- Birt, T., 100, 105
- Boccaccio, 258, 267
- Bodel, J., 154
- Boethius, 3, 132, 297
- Bogner, H., 26

- books, in the *Satyrical*, 3, 132, 175
 book titles, 299
 Boyce, B., 61, 64, 66, 74, 288
 Branham, B., 109
 brothel, 16, 79, 137, 143, 179, 237
 Bücheler, F., 4, 8–11, 40, 64, 100, 103–
 104, 118–119, 122, 140, 158, 175,
 246–249, 251, 254, 262, 284, 297
 Bürger, K., 106, 249, 255–258, 260–261,
 263, 269–272, 276–277, 279
 Burkert, W., 98
 Burman, P., 61–63, 109, 128
 Burriss, E. E., 140
Caesar. See Roman emperor
 Calame, C., 20
 Callirhoë, character in Chariton's novel,
 88, 95, 136
 Callirhoë, in letter of Pseudo-Aeschines,
 170
 Campania, 16, 110, 112, 122–127, 140,
 147, 152, 154, 156, 160, 172, 177–
 178, 248–249, 279–280, 285–286
 Caplan, H., 67–68, 70
 Cassius, Dio, 21, 78, 111, 126, 231, 242
 Cato, 21, 25, 126, 228–230, 233–235, 280
 Celsus, 133
Cena Trimalchionis, 3, 5–8, 16–17, 22, 59,
 61–63, 66, 68, 71, 78, 127–128, 132–
 133, 175, 196, 201, 210–211, 215,
 221
 Chariton, 44, 88, 93, 99, 106, 136, 154,
 207, 258
 Chaucer, 258
 Chrysippus, 280
 Chrysis, 33, 49, 119, 164, 185–186, 238–
 239
 Chrysostom, Dio, 56, 75
 Ciaffi, V., 120, 133, 156–157, 172, 243
 Cicero, 31–33, 43, 52, 60–61, 63, 100,
 106, 110, 112, 122, 125–126, 146,
 208, 241, 256–258, 260, 280, 283–
 285, 291
 Cichorius, C., 100, 104–105
cinaedi, 130–131, 134, 144, 170, 180, 241,
 297–298
 cinaedic poetry, 253, 298
 Circe, character in *Satyrical*, 33, 45, 82,
 118–120, 158–159, 161–166, 185–
 186, 238
 Clerc, M., 114, 283
 Clitophon, character in Achilles Tatius, 44,
 47, 88, 123, 136, 148, 167, 198, 203,
 207, 267
 Cocchia, E., 78
 Coccia, M., 13
 Coffey, M., 35
 Colin, J., 143
 Collignon, A., 16–17, 271–272, 275
colonia, 124–125
 comparison text, 15, 38, 54, 59–60, 62, 89,
 169, 191, 194
 Connors, C., 71–73, 219–220
 Conte, Gian Biagio, 22–23, 58, 102, 197,
 204, 215
 cooking, as deception, 50, 57, 181, 201.
 See food
correctio, 150, 214, 221
 Courtney, E., 105
 courts, 16, 61, 76, 83, 93, 154–156, 178,
 180, 203, 223, 229
 Croton, 94, 99, 104–105, 118, 126, 130,
 139, 155, 161, 166, 171, 185, 219,
 221, 223, 228, 232–233, 249, 273,
 295, 299–300
Crypta Neapolitana, 105, 124, 127–128,
 163, 170, 179
 Cumae, 125, 154, 280, 286, 299
 “Cupid and Psyche”, 204, 267
 Curiatius Maternus, 20, 228
 Cynicism, 34, 55–56, 116, 218, 223, 240,
 252–253, 300–301
 Daniel, Pierre, 9
 Dares, the Phrygian, 207
 de Valois, Adrien, 12, 62
Decamerone. See Boccaccio
 delivery. See gesticulation, performance
 Dell’Era, A., 13, 59
 Demetrius, 297
 Democritus, 280
 Demosthenes, 72, 280, 284–285
 Di Simone, M., 8
 Dihle, A., 75
 Diogenes Laertius, 56
 Diogenes of Sinope, 300
 Diogenes, the Cynic, 300
 Diomedes, the grammarian, 10

- Dionysius of Halicarnassus, 283
 Diphilus of Sinope, 113
 distichs, elegiac, 9–11, 18, 229–230. *See*
 elegy
 Dover, K. J., 242
 Dowden, K., 197
 drama, 18–19, 38–39, 42, 48, 77, 193, 233,
 299
 dreams, 107, 116, 129, 133, 138, 158, 196,
 205, 214
 earthquake, 140–141, 150, 154, 158, 178
editio Tornaesiana, 7–8, 140
 Edwards, C., 243
 Effe, B., 30, 95
 Ehlers, W., 14, 248
elegantia, 12–14, 63, 69
elegantiae arbiter, 13, 15, 25, 61
 elegy, 38, 42, 45, 230, 252. *See* distichs
 emendation, textual, 4–14, 119, 123, 158
 epic, 19, 36, 38, 42, 45, 50, 82–83, 103–
 106, 108, 132, 149–150, 154, 185,
 192, 201, 203, 207, 216, 220, 228,
 233, 240, 253–257, 272–275, 277,
 284–285
 Epicurus, 164, 280
 epigram, 10, 11, 92, 185, 219
 episodes, in the *Satyrica*, 4, 12, 14, 63, 87,
 96, 142, 147, 150, 160–161, 166,
 171–174, 210, 216, 246, 295
 Erasmus, 39
 Ernout, A., 8, 13, 40, 96, 109, 119, 122,
 140, 175
Erotos, Pseudo-Lucianic dialogue, 263–
 265, 266
ethopoeia, 30–31
 Eudoxus, 280
 Eumolpus, 33, 40–41, 49, 53–55, 57–58,
 71–73, 93–94, 96, 98, 109, 113, 116–
 118, 120–121, 126, 151, 153, 155,
 157, 159–160, 162, 171–172, 182–
 187, 204, 216, 218–221, 223, 225–
 227, 230–236, 238–239, 243, 266,
 281–282, 286, 289, 291, 295
 Euripides, 56, 72, 74, 252, 280, 284, 298
 Euthymenes, Massaliotic explorer, 114–
 115, 299–300
 exile, 94, 108–111, 113, 116, 118, 121,
 146, 150–152, 170, 176, 210, 231,
 283, 289
fabula, 16, 20, 74, 134, 159–160, 203,
 259–261, 267, 270, 277–278, 281,
 286, 290, 293–294, 296, 298
fabulator, 74
 Falernian wine, 7, 10, 130
 Faraone, C., 167
 faulty speech. *See oratio vitiosa*
fellatio, 138–139, 147
 Fellini, 99
 Fichte, Johann Gottlieb, 64
 food, metaphor for discourse, 57, 58, 208,
 218. *See* cooking
 Forcione, A. K., 17
 forgery, of *Satyrica*'s text, 5, 12, 61
 formalism, 15
 Fortunata, 121, 237
 Fortune, 10, 95–96, 106, 109, 112, 134,
 154, 156, 160, 165, 178, 180, 185,
 187, 223, 229, 257, 259, 272, 293–
 294
 Fraenkel, E., 9, 12, 14, 289
 fragments, of *Satyrica*, 3–5, 12, 14, 16, 22,
 27, 40, 42, 54, 56, 66, 87, 96, 108,
 113, 127–129, 133, 136–137, 154,
 170, 174–175, 230, 246, 248, 262,
 270, 274, 288
 frame narrative. *See Rahmenerzählung*
 freedmen, 140, 181, 212, 222
 freedmen at *Cena*, 12, 41, 49–50, 59–66,
 68–72, 76, 125, 181, 187, 210, 216–
 217, 228, 249, 281, 287, 289
 Friedländer, L., 5, 77
 Fronto, 123, 297
 Fulgentius, 3, 101, 141, 153–154
 Gaselee, S., 8, 62
 Genette, G., 40, 195–196, 279
 genre, 4, 16–18, 22, 27, 41–42, 45, 59, 71–
 72, 107, 151, 191, 203–204, 208–209,
 215, 245–246, 249, 251–252, 256,
 260, 262–263, 267, 269, 270–273,
 275–276, 279, 281, 296, 300–301
 George, P., 193
 gesticulation, 39, 47–48, 76, 237. *See*
 performance
 Gill, C., 194
 Giton, 18, 33, 41, 46, 49–50, 55, 95–96,
 99, 105, 108–109, 111, 114–116,

- 118–122, 129, 131–132, 134, 137–139, 143, 145, 147, 149–153, 156, 159–160, 164–165, 167, 171–172, 175–179, 181–186, 199, 210, 216, 219, 232–233, 238–239, 272, 281, 287, 292
- gladiators, 140–141, 143–144, 150, 158, 178
- gods, their role in ancient fiction, 106–107; impersonated, 107–108, 169–171
- Gorgias, character in *Satyrice*, 155, 158, 187
- Gowers, E., 57
- graffiti, 17, 60, 64, 66, 142
- grammar school, autobiographical fallacy of, 12–13, 22
- Grecisms, 62, 65, 69, 141, 287
- Greek literature, 21, 114–115, 212, 255, 287
- Greek names, in Roman palimpsests, 263, 281–283
- Greeks, 112, 114, 125, 227, 277, 281, 287–289, 291
- Habrocomes, 44, 88–90, 92, 107
- Hägg, T., 75, 88, 136, 193
- Halperin, D. M., 243
- happy ending, 106, 141, 257
- Harlow, R. B., 109
- Harrison, S., 209, 299
- Hedyle, 45, 118, 120–122, 124, 160, 172, 177–178, 184
- Heinsius (Heinse), Wilhelm, 11, 122, 225
- Heinze, R., 89, 95–96, 106, 136, 192–193, 198, 256, 272–275, 279
- Heliodorus, 17, 44, 88, 93, 99, 136
- Helm, R., 9, 158, 290–291
- Henderson, J., 242
- Henriksson, K.–E., 251, 299
- Herculaneum, 17
- Hercules, 20, 77, 138, 160, 202, 214
- Herculis Porticus*. See Portico of Hercules
- Herder, Johann Gottfried, 64
- Hermogenes, 30
- Heseltine, M., 46, 109, 122
- hexameters, 11, 34, 36, 56, 165, 214, 226, 252, 285
- Highet, G., 209
- Hinds, S., 42
- Hipponax, 98, 109
- Hippothous, 89–96, 106, 151, 160, 171
- historical author, 19, 21, 62, 193, 236
- historicism, 15, 21
- historiography, 31, 38, 43–44, 257
- Hodge, A. Trevor, 113
- Holzberg, N., 279
- Homer, 51, 56, 83, 148, 207, 220, 238, 280, 284–285, 289
- “homosexuality”, in *Satyrice*, 5, 89, 93–96, 139, 203
- Horace, 9, 94, 111, 126, 135, 212, 220, 222, 232, 251–252, 280, 283, 287
- Hypata, 99
- Hyperides, 280, 284
- identity, 19–25, 30–34, 37–38, 47–48, 57, 59, 62, 77, 82, 89, 103, 115, 125–126, 238–240, 249–250, 252, 280, 286, 290, 299
- Iliad*, 7, 94, 148, 158
- impersonation. See gods and *personae*
- impotence, 104–105, 139, 163–170, 186, 224, 228
- intentionality, 22–23, 72
- Iolaos*, papyrus, 57–58, 74, 170, 204, 247, 270, 279, 288, 298
- Isidore of Seville, 30, 36, 154, 231, 259, 283
- Isis, 25, 107, 152–153, 169, 177, 205, 290
- Italian humanism, 13, 61–62
- jealousy, 88, 93, 95, 105–106, 121, 167, 171–172, 182, 184, 231
- John of Salisbury, 231
- John the Lydian, 208, 252
- jokes, 11, 43, 49, 51, 63, 80, 111, 114, 168–169, 207, 211, 215–216, 237, 240, 252, 261, 300
- Jones, C. P., 41, 77, 269
- Jones, F., 194, 196–197
- Justin, 112
- Juvenal, 57, 74, 83, 93–94, 125, 131, 144, 208, 212, 241, 252, 286
- Kaster, R., 65, 222
- Kershaw, A., 282
- Klebs, E., 29, 104–106, 147, 192, 253–256, 272
- Kleinfeller, G., 110
- Konstan, D., 94

- Koster, S., 42
 Lactantius Placidus, 97
lacunae, in text of *Satyrica*, 6–9, 14, 119, 140
Latinitas, 68–70, 73
 laughter, 41, 50, 75, 138, 140, 178, 193, 215–216, 242, 268, 289
 law, 50, 58, 125, 151, 155–156, 213, 222–224, 230, 241, 252–253, 267, 284, 292
lectores, 74, 76
 Leiwo, M., 125
 Lejeune, P., 23
 LeMoine, F. J., 57
 Leucippe, 88, 107, 136, 167
libera cena, 132–134
 Lichas, 33, 45, 49, 81, 103, 107–109, 111, 116–118, 120–121, 124, 141, 149–155, 160–163, 171–172, 176–177, 184, 200, 219, 232, 239, 241, 254, 281
 lies and liars, 29, 33, 54, 93–94, 105, 114–115, 136, 196–197, 208, 217, 229, 238, 274, 300
 Lindberg, B., 61
 literary history, 28, 193, 245–246, 253, 256, 269, 272, 274, 276, 278
 Livy, 78, 100, 112, 125, 134, 152, 157, 283
 Long Fragments (L), 3, 6, 12
 Longus, 44, 93, 107, 207, 277
 Loukios of Patrai, 24–25, 88, 266, 290
 lovers, 18, 46, 120, 146, 151, 160, 178, 182, 208, 226, 296
 Lucan, 16, 71, 73, 112, 115, 235
 Lucas, H., 278
 Lucian, 24, 56, 74–75, 83, 88, 93–94, 207–209, 241–242, 261, 263, 278, 285, 297
 Lucilius, 49, 73, 214, 246, 252, 280, 283–285
 Lucius, 25, 73, 75, 78, 99, 101, 107, 111, 126, 142, 171, 197–198, 204–207, 242–243, 253, 258, 278, 290–291
 Luther, 39
 Lycurgus, character in *Satyrica*, 147, 152–153, 156–162, 172, 178, 182, 185
 lyric poets, nine, 280
 Maass, E., 82
 Macrobius, 208–209, 296
 magic. *See* sorcery
 Maiuri, A., 17, 126, 175
 Marchena, Jose, 5–6
 Marmorale, E. V., 5, 59
 Marseilles. *See* Massalia
 Martial, 82, 139, 270–271, 301
 masks. *See* *personae*
 Mason, H., 24–25, 267
 Massalia, 22, 62, 87, 96–97, 99–100, 102–116, 118, 120, 126, 152, 159–160, 171–172, 175–176, 210–212, 238, 249, 254, 283, 290, 293–294, 296, 300
 Massaliotic fables, 115, 300
 Maxwell, R., 41, 241, 297–298
 McDermott, M. H., 105
 memory, 11, 38, 43–45, 51–53, 58, 92, 122, 140, 184, 197–198, 205, 207, 219, 262, 264–265. *See* mnemonics, recollection, remembering
 Menelaos, character in *Satyrica*, 158, 203
 Menippus, 56, 58, 232, 249, 252
mentula. *See* penis
Metamorphoses of Apuleius, 9, 15–16, 25, 66, 73, 75, 101, 107, 121, 142, 157, 171, 175, 195, 198, 203–209, 242, 246, 253, 258–263, 267, 269, 276–278, 290–291, 296–298
Milesiaca, 258, 271, 278, 297–298
 Milesian fiction, 16, 192, 255, 258–261, 263–273, 276–278, 291, 293–298, 300–301
 mixed discourse, 17, 75, 191, 249, 253, 297. *See* prosimetry
 mixed discourse, logic of, 56–59, 300. *See* prosimetry
 mnemonics, 51–52
 Mommsen, Theodor, 17, 249–251, 256, 271, 279–281, 285–286
 Monaco, 123
 money, 9, 55, 91, 93, 98, 152, 159, 161, 169, 179–180, 182, 186, 216, 221, 223–224, 226–232, 234–235, 300
 morality, 5–6, 22, 28, 56, 96, 98, 115, 163, 198–199, 205–206, 209–210, 212, 214–215, 221, 223–224, 227, 229,

- 231, 235–236, 245, 300–301
 Möring, F., 41
 Most, G. W., 92–93, 198
 Müller, K., 3, 5, 7–9, 11–14, 17, 40, 119,
 122, 129–130, 132, 140, 248, 256,
 289
 Mulroy, D. D., 105, 141, 151
 Nagy, G., 20
 Naples, 124–128, 152, 170–171, 179–280,
 284, 286, 300
 narratology, 29–30, 32, 40, 192–193, 200,
 203
 national literatures, 15, 66, 212, 278
 nationalism, 63–64, 250, 278, 280
 Neptune, 107, 116, 122, 123
 Nero, 13, 15–16, 20–21, 25, 61, 76–78, 81,
 111, 115, 235, 241, 243
 Niceros, 33, 46, 50, 53, 60, 93, 216, 282,
 289
 Nietzsche, 205, 249
 Nodot, François, 5–6, 12, 140
 Norden, E., 263, 297
 novel, 17, 19, 23, 30, 41, 72, 75, 89, 93,
 96, 114, 133, 174, 191–196, 203, 209,
 236, 245–248, 253–258, 262, 266,
 269, 271–278, 281, 296
novella, 258, 273, 277–278
Novellen, in German literature, 258
 Odysseus, 74, 81–83, 92–94, 106, 115,
 197, 207, 232, 254, 266, 273, 300
Odyssey, 7, 56, 83, 92, 94, 102, 192, 207,
 232–233, 253–254, 266
opus (*Sat.* 132.15), 18, 21
oratio vitiosa, 69–71, 213
 originality, 28, 247, 249, 275, 292
 Osiris, 25, 107, 205
 Ostia, 126, 171–172, 176
 Otto, A., 147–149
 Ovid, 45, 97, 102, 126, 149, 163, 261,
 264–265, 270–271, 278, 282, 284,
 297, 301
 Pack, R., 105, 141–142
pacte autobiographique, 23
pagina (*Sat.* 80.9), 18
 Panayotakis, C., 38–39, 246, 276, 292
 Pannychis, 130–131, 143, 181, 295
 Paratore, E., 5, 17, 41, 97, 128, 147
 Parker, H. N., 14
 parody, 16–17, 73, 83, 89, 95, 102, 114,
 193, 220, 253–254, 273–274, 279,
 299
 Parthenios, 93, 95, 151
 pederasty, 93–94
 Pellegrino, C., 5, 9
 penis, 18, 98, 103, 105, 108, 120, 131,
 163–164, 166, 176, 180, 183, 185,
 239–240, 242, 273
 pentameter. *See* elegy, distichs
 performance, 19, 28–29, 35, 38, 43, 47–50,
 56, 59, 76–83, 152, 204, 209, 217,
 231, 234, 238, 243–244, 252, 268,
 274, 296, 305–307. *See* gesticulation
 Pergamene boy, 182, 295
 Perrochat, P., 5
 Perry, B. E., 16, 19, 105, 215, 253
 Persius, 73, 212, 252, 268, 285
personae, 11, 18–21, 24, 29–30, 32–34,
 36, 38–40, 42, 44, 47–49, 53, 57, 59,
 60, 62, 68, 73, 76, 78, 94, 193–195,
 197, 204, 211, 220, 224, 227–228,
 235–236, 246–247, 252–253, 257,
 259, 261, 267, 289, 292.
 personal narrative, 12, 21, 23, 25, 27, 30,
 75, 78, 92, 100, 136, 154, 175, 191,
 196, 198, 203–204, 209, 215, 245,
 261, 281, 296
 Petersmann, H., 57
 Petronian scholarship, 22–23, 26, 29, 64,
 76, 246–247, 271, 275
 Phaeacian tales, 74, 83, 92, 115, 197, 299.
See *Odyssey*
 Phidias, 227
 philology, 15, 23, 63, 78, 208, 246, 249–
 250, 253, 270, 276, 278
 philosophers, 34, 50, 56, 205, 232, 240–
 241, 300
 Photios, 23–24, 34, 114
 picaresque novel, 17, 19, 174, 248, 253,
 256, 271
 Pillars of Hercules, 88, 300
 Pindar, 72, 280, 284
 Plato, 43, 72, 77, 167, 207–208, 240, 268,
 280, 284–285
 Plautus, 9, 52, 74, 93, 113, 282, 287–289,
 298
 Pliny the Elder, 109, 130, 241

- Pliny the Younger, 41, 76, 297
 Plutarch, 41, 77, 93, 95, 113, 167, 242–243, 264, 298–299, 301
 Pompeii, 17, 64, 66, 140, 279
 Pomponius Mela, 112
 pornography, 5, 270, 293. *See antike Schmutz*
 Portico of Neptune, 122
 Portico of Hercules, 45, 118, 122, 177
 poverty, 6, 60, 97, 99, 104–105, 108, 114, 125, 146, 150, 153, 165–166, 176, 181, 211, 216, 223, 225–226, 232, 234, 275, 291, 295
 Priapus, 99–101, 103–108, 116, 127–131, 133, 153, 163–172, 179–180, 186, 228, 247, 254, 272–273
 priestesses, 107, 127, 129, 134, 180, 186, 228
 Priscian, 30, 270
 proleptic statements in *Satyrice*, 196
 Proselenos, 164, 186, 228
 prosimetry, 4, 9, 11, 42, 55, 58, 63, 72, 75, 95, 191, 204, 224, 246–247, 260, 263, 286, 288, 297–298. *See mixed discourse*
 Prussia, 64, 250
 Pseudo-Aeschines, 170
 Pseudo-Lucian, 93, 261–267
 Publilius Syrus, 74, 280
 Puccioni, G., 134
 Puteoli, 122, 124–128, 152, 171, 177, 286
 Pythagoras, 232
 Pytheas, Massaliotic explorer, 114, 115
 Quartilla, 5, 12, 14, 32, 39, 41, 47, 105, 107–108, 119, 123, 127–131, 133–135, 143–145, 153, 161, 166–170, 180–181, 186, 210, 239, 273, 295
 Quintilian, 17–18, 31, 33, 37, 41, 44–45, 53, 222, 252–253
Rahmenerzählung, 258, 265, 278
 Rankin, H. D., 26, 105, 193
 realism, 16, 19, 66, 74, 80, 142, 192, 245, 251, 253–255, 269–270, 274, 276–279, 281, 283, 285–287
 Reardon, B., 3, 92, 123, 154, 198
 reception of *Satyrice* in nineteenth century, 4, 28, 78, 94, 204, 246–255, 271–279, 288
 recognition, 21, 38, 73, 81, 239, 241, 254. *See anagnorismos*
 recollection, 27, 30, 43–45, 47, 53, 78, 92, 100, 154, 175, 191, 195–198, 201, 203, 206, 215, 245, 248, 261, 264, 266. *See memory, remembering, mnemonics*
 reconstruction, 27, 83, 87–88, 127, 136, 140, 142, 152, 161, 166–167, 169–175, 191, 210
 Reed, J. D., 22
 Reith, O., 209
 Reitzenstein, R., 255, 257–258, 300
 Relihan, J. C., 42, 55, 87
 remembering, 8, 25, 42–45, 118, 151, 162, 197, 227, 271
 Renaissance, 13, 17, 39, 61–62
 rhetoric, 16, 29–35, 39, 42–45, 52, 55, 57–58, 68–69, 71, 77, 81, 91, 94, 110–111, 117, 125, 127, 138–141, 148–150, 154, 161–162, 175, 179, 192, 194, 210–212, 216, 220–225, 235, 257–258, 273–276, 281–289
Rhetorica ad Herennium, 31–32, 37–38, 51, 66, 67–69, 71, 79, 256
 Ribezzo, F., 122–123
 Richardson, T. W., 3, 9, 102, 144
 Rohde, E., 248–249, 255–258, 271–279
 Roman emperor, 13–16, 20–21, 74, 76, 111–115, 126, 157, 185, 207, 230–231, 233, 235, 241–243, 251, 291
 Romm, J. S., 83
 Rose, K. F. C., 5, 16, 22, 102, 124–125, 286
 Rosenblüth, M., 16, 41, 275–279
 Rosetta stone, 15
 Ruiz-Montero, C., 293
 Sage, E. T., 175
 Sallust, 43
 Salonius, A. H., 65, 288
 Sandy, G., 157, 170, 209, 246, 276
 satire, 17, 115, 208, 232, 247, 249, 252, 300
 satyr plays, 193, 208, 243, 251, 253
satyrion, 130, 167, 171, 180. *See aphrodisiac*
 satyrs, 218, 233, 240, 243, 251
 scapegoatery, 97–98, 104, 108–109, 118,

- 120, 152, 176
 scazons, 214, 285
Scheintod, 41, 136, 171
Schelmanroman. *See* picaresque novel
 Schmeling, G., 5, 9, 104, 128, 142, 145,
 149, 164, 171–172, 175, 197, 256,
 281–282
 Schmid, G., 255, 258
scholastici, 49, 57, 63, 65, 69, 114, 126,
 142, 214–218, 225, 289, 300
 Seneca the Elder, 45, 52, 111, 157, 283
 Seneca the Younger, 11, 16–17, 58, 60, 73,
 78, 97, 100, 111, 115, 140, 144, 235,
 241, 247, 249, 282, 297
 Sergent, B., 93
sermo adtenuatus, 67–68, 70, 72–73
 Servius Honoratus, Maurus, 3, 21, 96–101,
 108, 115, 152, 241
 Seven Sages, 258
 Sextus Empiricus, 80
 Sgobbo, I., 12, 127–128, 135
 shipwreck, 94, 185
 Short Fragments (O), 5
 short story. *See* *novella*
 Sidonius, Apollinaris, 3, 99–104, 108, 166,
 169, 254, 268, 293–295
 Silius Italicus, 97, 112
simplicitas, 21, 25, 155, 211
 Sirens, 82, 94
 Sisenna, Cornelius, 258–259, 261–262,
 265, 267, 271, 288, 297–298
 Slater, N. W., 5, 10–11, 17–19, 22, 35–36,
 39, 105, 194–196, 276
 Smith, M. S., 5, 13
 solecism, 50, 60, 62, 65–66, 68–70, 74,
 288
 Sophocles, 21, 72, 280, 284
 sorcery, 109, 168, 206
 Sotadean verse, 57, 131, 164, 241
 Sotades, 297
 Souza, Janus, 109, 128
 Soverini, P., 139
 stage directions, 48
 Stanzel, F. K., 30
 Starr, R. J., 76
 Statileo, Marino, 12, 60–63
 Statius, 71, 97, 126, 143
 Stefenelli, A., 109
 Stephens, S., 4, 74, 247, 256, 270, 288
 Stolz, W., 5
 Strabo, 110, 114, 125, 126, 297
 Stubbe, H., 18, 26
 stylistics, 13, 69, 214
 Suerbaum, W., 93
 Suetonius, 20, 74, 140, 146, 150, 157,
 241–242
 Sulla, 111, 125
 Sullivan, J. P., 16–19, 46, 105, 109, 128,
 141, 174–175, 193, 209, 235
 Sulpicius Rufus, Servius, 229–230, 280
 Süß, W., 65–66
 Sybaritic tales, 299–300
Sybaritica, 270–271, 297–298, 300
 Syme, R., 26
 Synesius, 242
 Tacitus, 13, 15, 21, 25–26, 61–62, 97, 103,
 110–112, 124–125, 140, 228
 Taplin, O., 74
 Terence, 33, 48, 282
 theatricality, 38–42, 74–78
 Theophrastus, 130, 167, 249
 Thessaly, 88, 266, 292, 300
 Thucydides, 44, 75, 93, 151, 207, 280, 284
 Tiberius, 111, 133, 140, 157, 169, 231,
 248
Tinouphis, papyrus, 74, 270, 288
 tragedy, 20–21, 42, 73, 92–93, 145, 193,
 228, 273, 282
Traguriensis, manuscript of *Cena*, 3, 7–8,
 10–12, 60, 62
 Trahman, C. R., 94
 Trimalchio, 7, 10–11, 13–14, 22, 32, 34,
 41, 43, 46–47, 49–50, 53, 60, 65, 70–
 71, 79–81, 93, 105, 120–121, 123,
 125–127, 132–135, 141, 143, 145,
 154–155, 167, 171, 181, 201–202,
 210–211, 215–218, 222, 225, 229–
 231, 233, 249, 279–280, 282, 286–
 287, 289
 Trimpi, W., 25
Troiae Halosis, 71, 73
 Tryphaena, 33–36, 107, 109, 111, 116–
 122, 124, 141–143, 152–153, 157,
 160, 172, 176–177, 184, 199, 281,
 299
umbrae, 135

- urbs Graeca*, 46, 105, 122–124, 127–128,
 133, 153, 161, 166–167, 171, 228,
 280–281, 285–286, 289
 Valerius Maximus, 112
 Valla, Lorenzo, 13, 61–62
 van Thiel, H., 3, 6, 8, 12, 149, 175
 Varro, 17, 57–58, 247–249, 251, 283, 288,
 297
 Vergil, 50, 93, 102, 123, 130, 149, 249
verkehrte Sprache. *See oratio vitiosa*
 Veyne, P., 19, 22, 193
 Vidal-Naquet, P., 93
villae, 16, 147, 152–153, 156–161, 172,
 178, 181, 185
 Virgil, 21, 36–37, 45, 71, 97, 100–101,
 127, 141, 220, 280, 283, 287
 Vogt-Spira, G., 78
 voice, 11, 23, 27, 32, 34–40, 44, 47–48,
 52, 55, 58–59, 67, 75–78, 82, 116,
 119, 205, 211, 215, 227, 230, 237,
 251, 262, 289–291
Volkssprache, 64, 66
 von Guericke, Arminius, 17, 64
 von Wilamowitz-Möllendorff, U., 248,
 270, 275
 Wackernagel, H., 111
 Wagenseil, Johan Christoph, 12, 61–62
 Walcott, P., 94
 Walsh, P. G., 11, 17, 19, 39–40, 46, 82,
 97, 105, 123, 142, 193, 209, 227, 276,
 281
 Waters, W. E., 175
 widow of Ephesus, 119, 184, 295
 Williams, C. A., 131, 139
 Williams, G., 287, 292
 Winkler, J. J., 4, 15, 23, 74, 136, 175, 195,
 242, 247, 256, 269–270, 278, 288
 Wucher, A., 250–251
 Wylie, K., 98
 Xenophon of Ephesus, 44, 107
 Zeitlin, F., 209
 zodiac, 7, 14

Abstract

While nineteenth-century scholars debated whether the fragmentary *Satyrica* of Petronius should be regarded as a traditional or an original work in ancient literary history, twentieth-century Petronian scholarship tended to take for granted that the author was a unique innovator and his work a synthetic composition with respect to genre. The consequence of this was an excessive emphasis on authorial intention as well as a focus on parts of the text taken out of the larger context, which has increased the already severe state of fragmentation in which today's reader finds the *Satyrica*.

The present study offers a reading of the *Satyrica* as the mimetic performance of its fictional *auctor* Encolpius; as an ancient "road novel" told from memory by a Greek exile who relates how on his travels through Italy he had dealings with people who told stories, gave speeches, recited poetry and made other statements, which he then weaves into his own story and retells through the performance technique of vocal impersonation. The result is a skillfully made narrative fabric, a travelogue carried by a desultory narrative voice that switches identity from time to time to deliver discursively varied and often longish statements in the *personae* of encountered characters.

This study also makes a renewed effort to reconstruct the story told in the *Satyrica* and to explain how it relates to the identity and origin of its fictional *auctor*, a poor young scholar who volunteered to act the scapegoat in his Greek home city, Massalia (ancient Marseille), and was driven into exile in a bizarre archaic ritual. Besides relating his erotic suffering on account of his love for the beautiful boy Giton, Encolpius intertwines the various discourses and character statements of his narrative into a subtle brand of satire and social criticism (e.g. a critique of ancient capitalism) in the style of Cynic popular philosophy.

Finally, it is argued that Petronius' *Satyrica* is a Roman remake of a lost Greek text of the same title and belongs—together with Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*—to the oldest type of Greco-Roman novel, known to antiquity as Milesian fiction.

Ancient Narrative Supplementa

1. Paschalis, Michael & Stavros Frangoulidis (eds.). *Space in the Ancient Novel*. 2002. ISBN 90 807390 2 2.
2. Jensson, Gottskálk. *The Recollections of Encolpius. The Satyrical of Petronius as Milesian Fiction*. 2004. ISBN 90 807390 8 1.